

SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

50 California Street • Suite 2600 • San Francisco, California 94111 • (415) 352-3600 • Fax: (415) 352-3606 • www.bcdc.ca.gov

September 26, 2013

TO: Design Review Board Members

FROM: Lawrence J. Goldzband, Executive Director (415/352-3653; lgoldzband@bcdc.ca.gov)
Ellen Miramontes, Bay Design Analyst (415/352-3643; ellenm@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Draft Minutes of September 9, 2013 BCDC Design Review Board Meeting

1. **Call to Order and Attendance.** The Design Review Board's Chair, John Kriken, called the meeting to order at approximately 6:15 p.m. Other Design Review Board members in attendance included Cheryl Barton, Ephraim Hirsch, and Gary Strang. BCDC staff in attendance included Bob Batha, Erik Buehmann, Brad McCrea, Ellen Miramontes, and Ming Yeung. The Port's Waterfront Design Advisory Committee members in attendance included Chair Dan Hodapp, Kathrin Moore, David Alumbaugh, and Marsha Maytum. Prior to the start of the official meeting, the Port hosted a site visit beginning at 4:30 p.m. during which the Board and Committee members, staff members and the public walked throughout the project site to observe existing conditions and learn of various historic features.

2. **Approval of Revised Draft Minutes for June 10, 2013 Meeting.** The Board approved the revised June 10, 2013 meeting minutes with no further changes.

3. **Crane Cove Park Project, Port of San Francisco Pier 70, City and County of San Francisco (Third Pre-Application Review).** The Board conducted its third pre-application review of the Port of San Francisco's proposal to construct an approximately nine-acre public park at Pier 70. The proposal includes the construction of a multi-use park within an area historically used for shipbuilding and repair operations. Within the Commission's Bay and 100-foot shoreline band jurisdiction, the proposal includes open lawn areas, gardens, seating and picnic areas, playgrounds, non-motorized small boat facilities, public art, preservation of historic site elements, and a small portion of one development site.

For a transcript of the meeting proceedings, including the BCDC staff introduction, the Port's project presentation, Board questions, public comments, Board discussion and the Port's response, please see the attached transcription.

a. **Board Summary and Conclusions**

(1) **Proposed Development Site.** Reiterating comments from their previous reviews, the Board continued to express concern regarding impacts of the proposed development site on the park. Concerns included blocking views to the Bay, shading of and close proximity to the beach area, and decreased public safety in the park due to less visibility from the street. The Board suggested that the Port explore other locations for this proposed development. Some members strongly believe that the development site should be removed from this location.



Making San Francisco Bay Better

(2) **Phasing of Park.** The Board recommended that the Port reconsider the park phasing. The Board believes that the two park phases adjacent to Illinois Street should be developed first to create maximum visual access to the shoreline and then the Maritime Fields area on the eastern side of the park should to be developed last.

(3) **Grading and Connections Along Illinois Street.** The Board expressed some confusion and concern regarding the proposed grading along the western edge of the site. Regarding the southwest corner, the Board was concerned that historic features would be covered while also acknowledging the desire for a smooth transition between the corner of 19th and Illinois Streets and the park. Some members believe that the proposed re-grading is out of character with the sites' historic purpose. The Board also expressed a desire to maintain a midblock entry into the park, as had been previously included in the design, to increase connectivity along this edge. The Board recommended grading adjustments be made in this area if it would help accomplish a mid-block entry. Regarding the northwestern portion of the site, the Board expressed concern about the proposed 4-foot elevation increase for the development site and how this grade change would transition to the adjoining parcel north and to the beach.

(4) **Access for Persons with Disabilities.** The Board stated the importance of designing the park to provide full access to persons with disabilities.

(5) **Trees.** The Board debated the appropriateness of trees in the park. While some members felt that trees would not be appropriate within the historic industrial setting, others expressed a desire to include some trees for shade.

4. **Adjournment.** Mr. Kriken adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

ELLEN MIRAMONTES
Bay Design Analyst

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO BAY CONSERVATION
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

JOINT REVIEW -
BCDC DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
AND PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO'S
WATERFRONT DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

PIER 70
NOONAN BUILDING
AT THE FOOT OF 20TH STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2013
6:00 P.M.

INDEX

	Page
1. Site Visit	--
2. Call to Order for Meeting	3
3. Approval of Revised Minutes for June 10, 2013 Meeting	3
4. Crane Cove Park, Port of San Francisco Pier 70, City and County of San Francisco (Third Pre-Application Review)	3
5. Adjournment	47

PROCEEDINGS

6:15 p.m.

PORT STAFF MEMBER DAVID BEAUPRE: -- temporary port-a-potty. And then there's a blue key hanging on the coat rack right there, that's for a restroom on the second level. The door to the second level is the second from the last door on the right. The restroom is on the second level on the west side of the building. If you could just remember to bring the key back so we can all use the restroom that would be great.

SPEAKER: So is it a key to the restroom or key to the building?

MR. BEAUPRE: Key to the building door, the restroom is open.

Also I just wanted to recognize that we don't have amplified sound as a part of this meeting so if we could limit our side conversations so that we can all hear one another that would be great.

And with that I would like to introduce Erik Buehmann from BCDC.

BCDC DRB SECRETARY ELLEN MIRAMONTES: Well actually first our Chair, John Kriken, will kick off. We have to --

SPEAKER: Okay.

MS. MIRAMONTES: -- do the minutes and a couple of things on that note.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I am going to call to order the September 9th meeting of the combined BCDC Design Review Board and the San Francisco Port Design Advisory Board.

The first order of business will be to approve the minutes of our -- for BCDC for the June 10th meeting. And I want to ask if there are any additions or deletions from those from the BCDC board?

If none may I have a hand raise if they're approved, please. All approved?

Thank you. Dan.

WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Similarly, the Waterfront Design Advisory Committee, in attendance are Kathrin Moore, David Alumbaugh, Marsha Maytum and myself, Boris Dramov is absent, and we have minutes from June 10th, 2013 as well. Are there any changes on our Committee from those meetings -- from that meeting?

They stand approved as presented then. Thank you, John.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay. Before we start I'd like to give everyone here an overview of the process we are going to go through. Erik is going to give us a presentation of the issues that have been brought up for this project and that's the first order of business.

The second will be that the applicant will make a presentation. And I hope we can keep that sort of tight because we have met together before and we have had this nice walk and I think we just need to give everybody a kind of broad overview.

Then there is a period where the Board has questions of the applicant. And that's just to fill in gaps that perhaps weren't covered.

The next step is audience comments. And I'd like to ask how many people here might like to speak this evening? Let's see if we can count that. One, two, three, four, five. Okay, there's about ten. And I just use that to -- so we can time it.

SPEAKER: There's about 15 or 20.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Oh, 15 or 20? Well, we're hoping you can keep your remarks to under three minutes, let's say.

Then we go into a very open discussion talking about the strengths and the possible issues that remain with this design.

And then may come to some conclusions or points we will ask the applicant to do.

And then the last step is the applicant responding to our comments.

So those are the steps we are going to go through this evening.

So the first step is Erik.

SPEAKER: I'm sorry, could you give your name, I didn't get it.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Sorry. John Kriken.

SPEAKER: How do you spell that?

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: K-R-I-K-E-N.

(Someone speaking in background.)

SPEAKER: I'm sorry? Oh, I didn't see that.

SPEAKER: K-R-I-K-E-N.

MR. BUEHMANN: Okay. In the interest of time I am making my introduction brief because I know the Port has an extensive presentation for you. The proposal is for the construction of a multi-use park called Crane Cove Park, on the footprint of a historic shipbuilding and repair operation at Pier 70 in San Francisco.

This is the third joint DRB and Port of San Francisco Waterfront Design Advisory Committee review of this project.

The first review was held at BCDC's offices on January 7th, 2013. At that meeting the DRB and WDAC requested that the applicant clarify the impact of the future development sites on the public access, consider exploring design concepts to pull the site together, reconsider the design of the maritime fields, refine treatment of the Bay edge, provide a clear and continuous path along the shoreline edge and maintain an industrial feel at the site.

Other issues such as stormwater treatment, public safety, elevated views and sea level rise impacts were also raised. Additionally, the WDAC and DRB requested more information regarding boating facilities and project phasing.

The second review was held at the Port of San Francisco's offices on June 10th, 2013. At that meeting the WDAC and DRB requested the applicant consider five issues:

1. The Board continues to be concerned that the project design is fragmented and encourages the design team to simplify the current scheme and develop a unifying overall design concept.
2. Slipway 4 is an essential historic resource of the site that must be restored, and is a natural nexus of the site design. The zones around Slipway 4 should be simplified and reduced, allowing the park to be mostly defined by Slipway 4 and the shipyard beyond.
3. Maritime use should be a driving force in the design and made stronger through the greater emphasis and opportunity for land-water connections.
4. The Board remains concerned with the lack of definition in the development parcels and the ability to adequately foresee and respond to their impact on the park design. A firm understanding of the parcel height, massing, and use is needed to establish an appropriate and successful relationship to the park. There was a particular concern whether the buffer between the development and the park is adequate.

5. It is important that three-dimensional representations of the proposed park design are included in future presentations.

The Board should consider whether the Port has adequately responded to this feedback. That's it.

MR. BEAUPRÉ: Thank you, Erik. My name is David Beaupré, I'm a planner with the Port and I wanted to thank everyone for coming this evening. A great many of you were able to make the site tour and I appreciate that. Hopefully that allows many a greater understanding of the site and its scale and the magnitude of the project.

I also wanted to just introduce Alma DuSolier from AECOM, Patricia Fonseca from AECOM, both designers on the park that have been working with us for a couple of years now on developing this preferred master plan.

And we also have Matt Davis from Architectural Resource Group who is Historic Preservation Planner working on the park with AECOM.

We also have civil and structural engineers and cost estimators on the team as well but for tonight's meeting we felt that these were the core designers and planners for the project. There is also a lot of Port staff here, Byron Rhett, Diane Oshima, Brad Benson, Steven Real, Mark Paez.

SPEAKER: Gerry Roybal (phonetic names).

MR. BEAUPRÉ: Gerry Roybal, thank you. Here to possibly answer questions if needed.

As John mentioned, we have been in front of the Design Review Board twice before. We think that we have learned a lot from them and a lot of the comments that they brought to us has helped us improve the design. In addition, I think you'll see that the Port and the design team have done a significant amount of work to get to the point we're at. So hopefully people can appreciate the evolution of the design and the design process.

Our presentation to go over the design concept is going to be about an hour long but we think that's necessary to present the comprehensive work that we have done and provide it in the necessary context that it is.

Here is our agenda. We have already done the introduction. We are going to talk a little bit about the site understanding. Myself and Matt Davis and then Alma from AECOM will present the concept and then I'll come back and talk about the infill development parcels and the cost of the park and the phasing.

Erik just read to us what some of the comments were regarding the last Design Review Board meeting so I am not going to go through them all together since he just read them but there they are again. And again.

So I just wanted to remind everybody, the site location. Again, we just walked it. Generally, the Crane Cove Park site is between 19th Street and Mariposa Street, with Illinois Street along the western boundary and the Bay and ship repair to the east. We are right down here on the greater Pier 70 site.

Here is an aerial photograph of the park site in the context of all of Pier 70. Here is the Ramp Restaurant; here is Dogpatch.

And then specifically, here is a general outline of the park area and the park area boundaries, including the adjacent development parcel we have been looking at.

I wanted to provide a little bit of context of how Crane Cove Park fits within the greater Pier 70 and Mission Bay/Dogpatch area. It's along the Bay Trail and the Blue Greenway. We have future bayfront parks coming in at Mission Bay, Crane Cove Park, the new Slipways Park, we have the waterfront site and a series of other upland open spaces. And this will be the ultimate alignment of the Bay Trail and the Blue Greenway through the site.

Looking at places and opportunities for human-powered boating.

A possible ferry connection has been identified at 16th Street. And as a part of the Pier 70 Plan we looked at a ferry terminal at the terminus of 20th Street.

Looking at extending 19th Street in and across into the ship repair operations here. So that's a new 19th Street continuation of the city grid.

Again, this is where we started out between 2007 and 2010. The Port worked through an extensive community planning process for all of Pier 70. It included retention of ship repair, establishment of the National Register Historic District. And all those historic structures are identified in red, salmon and pink. New waterfront and upland open spaces identified in green and then in orange, new infill development. All of that recognizing the need for new infrastructure and site remediation to deal with 150 years of industrial operations that have happened at Pier 70.

Since we completed the Preferred Master Plan the Port has gone back and divided Pier 70 into five sub-districts. We have the ship repair area in purple. I'm working with our tenant, BAE, who is here tonight, on how to continue to make improvements and continue that operation.

We've got the historic core. Our host tonight is Orton Development. They're working on these seven buildings on either side of 20th Street, the most important historic resources on the site.

In blue is the waterfront site. The Port has brought on Forest City as our development partner for that.

And we're working on what we call the Hill site down in here, which includes Irish Hill, a PG&E-owned parcel and what we call Parcel 2 here.

When we started the project we looked at what are the adjacent open spaces in the direct, immediate area and how are those open spaces being functioned? How can Crane Cove Park complement those existing or planned open spaces so that we don't duplicate the program? So we have the Mission Bay Bayfront Parks in the Mission Bay park system, we know that we have the Slipways Park in the waterfront site and eventually we will have a connection around the power plant site over to Warm Water Cove Park. So again, I wanted to look at the different programs of uses. How can Crane Cove Park complement the existing and planned open spaces?

Community outreach. We started in actually 2011 by developing a scope of work that would allow us to go through a community planning process.

In March of 2012 we presented through the Central Waterfront Advisory Group to the Port Commission and the Potrero Boosters our existing conditions, opportunities and constraints.

In May of 2012 we had two workshops and over 100 participants to talk about alternative concept plans we developed. We went to the Port Commission, our CWAG, San

Francisco Architectural Heritage, the Boosters. We had on-line surveys. All the information was available on-line.

Then in December we presented a Draft Park Master Plan, a cost estimate and phasing proposal. We went through the same process again, hosted community workshops, went to the WDAC and DRB, went to the Boosters, went to our Central Waterfront Advisory Group, went to Architectural Heritage, had ways -- a plethora of ways for people to tell us what they thought about the Plan, our ideas and concepts and what has truly led us today to the evolution.

And then again the same process in May through July. Community workshops, design review, Potrero Boosters, Architectural Heritage, on-line surveys.

Then in August we started the process again of key stakeholder outreach. We went to the Historic Preservation Commission. Went to the adjacent tenants and continued to work with them. So you can see we have gone through a pretty extensive community outreach.

With that we have developed a Revised Crane Cove Park Master Plan that includes the urban beach, which we talked about, the open green, the maritime fields and Slipway 4, Crane Plaza and Keel Park, and the 109/110 yard area.

And here is an illustration of that overall plan. We are going to circle back to that but I wanted to give you a sneak peek at what it looked like, early. We are going to go through some of our site understanding and analysis.

Here is a map that should look familiar to those that came out on the tour with us. We started behind the ramp. Here is the Kneass Boatworks, here is 18th Street. We came in, walked out here, walked back over here. Here is Building 30. This is all of Slipway 4 including the cranes, the utility racks, the runways and the slipway. Building 110, Slipways 1, 2 and 3, Building 109. Also Illinois Street and the Illinois Street historic fence.

These are some of the key factors that kind of rose to the top that developed in the evolution of the plan. They are things that we heard about and we knew we had to address as a part of the design process.

We know that there is projected sea level rise of about 52 inches. And with that sea level rise comes increased storm events and also requires us to design for that.

We know that there are grading and environmental remediation, these go hand in hand.

There are contaminations of concern out there, we need to cap the site. And with that, capping requires some grading. It also links directly into sea level rise. How do we protect our investment so that the park functions when the sea level does rise and there are waves -- storm events.

How do we connect the site to the land and the water? One of those ways we talked about is 19th Street. We also have a connection at 18th Street. We also have the connection behind the ramp. We are also looking at accessing the site from the water for human-powered boaters. And doing it in a way that doesn't affect the ship repair operations or the boat repair operations to the north.

And then we also know, as we go back to the overall Pier 70 plan, we have to balance everything across Pier 70, we can't look at these projects discretely. And through that planning process we've identified a balance of where new development could happen and should happen, where historic preservation should happen and where it can't happen, where new open

space should happen and can happen but maybe can't happen as well. So we have to balance that all across the site so that Pier 70 works as a whole.

And then last but not least, historic preservation. How do we make certain that we retain the integrity of the National Register District once it gets nominated? We can't impact all the resources. We know we can impact some. We want to preserve as many as we can. But more importantly, we want to make certain that in 20 years when we are all out here enjoying the park we know it's part of a larger district and it's not -- it's not separate at all. So we want to integrate historic preservation into the design of the park.

So just to cover some of these very briefly. Here is the study we did on sea level rise. This dark blue line shows where the water goes on peak tides. I was kind of matching this up out around the Kneass building and the shoreline. This is where it is today.

If we did nothing this is how the site would be in 2100. During a 100-year flood and storm event nearly the entire site would be underwater. During just regular 2100 mean high water, much of the site would be inundated with water. So we need to look at how do we protect the investment we're making.

Grading and remediation. Again, this is the site topography with the yellow being lower -- the green being lower and the yellow being higher. How do we -- how do we bring the site up to the neighborhood and how do we also cap and remediate areas that can't have human contact with the area, they can't go hand in hand.

And this is just a photograph of that grade difference that we talked about there where it's at grade at 18th Street but about 17th, beneath grade at Illinois Street, at 19th Street.

Again the connectivity. I talked about how we connect to the park and the neighborhood into the water.

And then how do we provide access in a safe way for kayakers, but also in a way that respects the ship repair operations and it doesn't interfere with those operations. It's a legitimate safety concern. And what we have done is work with the ship repair operator to identify where a clear zone is. We understand what SF Boat Works needs to continue to repair ships. How do we thread the needle to accommodate human-powered boaters in a safe way?

And then the development parcels. This illustration shows what we considered as a part of the Pier 70 preferred plan, going through the three year planning process, the balancing of all the different goals.

Shortly thereafter as we got into planning the park we started to look at, could we possibly move the ship repair into Slipways 1 and 2, move this development parcel up to where that operation was. And through the planning process we learned that there wasn't a great deal of support for that so we backed away from that and developed a solution where we took the development site and put it there, kept the boat repair where it was and removed this and left the development parcel here. And continuing to work with the community.

What we are looking at now is this one development parcel along Illinois Street. We have taken the development parcel out of the ramp parking area. And looking at how this in-fill would be appropriate in scale and use and support the use and program of the park.

And then with that I would like to introduce Matt from Architectural Resource Group.

MR. DAVIS: Thank you, David. My name is Matthew Davis from ARG. I just wanted to talk a little bit about our role on the team and how we went about supporting AECOM and the Port.

And our role was really two-fold, one, to supply background historical information to the Port and to AECOM to help support the design and to sort of monitor and continue to be involved in the ongoing design to make sure that it evolves in a way that is in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation.

So we really asked four questions in doing our analysis. First, you know, for each of the features on the site that was identified as contributing to the district, what are the character-defining features of that element?

What -- and what are the interpretive opportunities and story lines that that particular element supports?

Thirdly, you know, what general guidelines for future treatment of each element would be proposed?

And in particular, what future uses would be appropriate>?

So you kind of move from what's historic to how that historic significance can be incorporated into a loved and well-used site.

So you see here a portion of the proposed National Register District that focuses in the Crane Cove Park area.

One thing I wanted to emphasize is that in the Master Plan you have these three categories, Very Significant, Significant and Context. That's really a planning distinction. In the eyes of the California Office of Historic Preservation these are all contributors, there is no - from a legalistic standpoint - no significant difference between the brick, you know, salmon and pink. I forget what the best term for this shade is.

(Laughter.)

MR. DAVIS: But you get the idea. That you have a lot of different kinds of resources within the park. And one thing that is very important to recognize is that what makes this a district is that all of these buildings were working together and that all of them, you know, they date from different periods but they were all tied into the very complicated and very space-consumptive process that is ship building. And it's good to keep that in mind.

Slipway 4 enjoys a certain prominence just because of its magnitude, its orientation, but there are lots of pieces around the site that are just as involved in the shipbuilding process. Keep that in mind.

Here is a 1915 Sanborn map of the site. This is when Slipway 4 was actually two slips, 5 and 6, and it was also shorter, a bit shorter then. I believe you said on the tour that one of the lines you see where the existing pier -- the existing slip is partially in-fill, does reference the shorter period immediately before US entry into World War I.

You see Building 109 is here. It's from 1912. It was not built for World War I but actually it came to -- to be when Union Iron Works exploded in significance following the opening of the Panama Canal. So in 1912 they built a new plate shop and boat launch, they greatly expanded their capacity. It turned out that a few years later it was heading for World War I-related ship building.

This is the full build-out, a snapshot of the 1945 site plan, which I doubt many of you have seen, if not many, many times. And you have the current configuration of Slipway #4 and then now you also see all of the World War II era buildings, 110, Building 150. The Building 30 here and the Galvanized Plant, Building 49. You also see here too how Slipways 1, 2, 3 and 4 -- sorry, Slipway 3 did extend out and connect with Slipway 4, which we lose track of now on the site.

This, I don't really -- this is from '59, it doesn't really show anything more than World War II. It's just one of the prettiest maps I've ever seen in my life. It includes the whole Pier 70 site so I like to throw it in there. It's incredibly detailed and it was very useful for us in looking in particular at some of the railroad track along this.

So this map just summarizes the different eras that are associated. You've got sort of three waves on Crane Cove Park. You have the first decade of the 1900s, the sort of pre-World War I era when you had the opening of the Panama Canal expand shipbuilding. Then you had the World War I build-up, and then roughly speaking, you have the World War II build-up.

Now, as we were monitoring the ongoing design and offering our input, you know, it's a complicated site with a lot of moving parts. And so what we tried to do is sort of categorize our feedback into some useful groupings. And then I also want to offer some comments today within each of those grouping with particular emphasis on how the design has changed most recently in ways that sort of enhance the treatment for resources.

So first of all, let's go through these. You know, we looked at the overall approach offered by the park.

What site access and circulation looks like in the park.

The treatment of Slipway #4 was obviously paramount.

The treatment of Buildings 109 and 110, clearly these are central to any reuse of the site as a park with some level of services.

Somewhat secondarily, Buildings 30, 49 and 50 would also play a key role in how the space was tied together.

Cranes 14 and 13, because they are the most prominent, visual indicators of the park, we looked at those carefully to see how they would be incorporated into the overall park design.

Where would the development parcel or parcels be?

Okay. So here's a picture of the site. So where do I go to here? Yes.

So here is the Plan. So I wanted to just offer some comments. And these will be my last comments here, last slide. In each of those categories about things that ARG has noted about the most recent iteration of the design that speak well to the way historical resources are being treated. I mean, obviously, as you can tell from the tour and I think from the whole here that the overall approach is very sensitive to the historical resources that are present at the site and those resources are really showcased as being one of the primary generators of the area's interest and attraction.

I think the partial re-grading of the sites in this manner to bring about to street level has been done in a way that doesn't disguise the historic extent of the slipway, which I think is a great and not insignificant accomplishment.

More recently you have had the addition of these overlooks that extend some of the viewing opportunities for people using the park to really get out over the water and look back

at the park and appreciate the scale of what is still there and what was there before. That's a nice additional feature that's recently been incorporated into the design.

We also felt that the way the different zones of the park are programmed and arranged really emphasizes the primacy of Slipway 4.

And in terms of circulation and site access, the other feature -- in addition to not disguising the historical extent of Slipway 4, this creating, obviously, the important aspect is that it significantly increases site access and really turns this into a community resource, where it's now behind a fence, beneath a wall, et cetera, et cetera.

And we also felt that this new pathway, comparatively new pathway, does a better job of tying the space together without inadvertently disguising the extent of any of the historic features. In particular here Slipways 1, 2 and 3, they are no longer (indiscernible), they are not contributors to the district. But they also -- they still help to create some of the historic character of the place. And so it's fantastic to have a pathway here that takes people through the outer ends of the slipways without obscuring how far, how much further out into the water these used to extend.

We also were excited to see the programming, this sort of malleable elements of Slipway 4, the keel blocks, the cribbing and other elements that can be moved around. And we think that that's a key aspect that really speaks to the way that ships were built with the cribbing that is often purpose-built for a given ship, torn down and then rebuilt according to the next ship's specifications. And that really lends itself to a very malleable park space.

For Buildings 109 and 110, the Port has the advantage there of buildings that are very conducive to reuse. I mean, Building 109 in particular has a limited, closed wall, it's almost a pavilion already; 110, is really one big open space. And both of those can accommodate a wide variety of future reuses while preserving those assets of the built fabric that are important.

One new element in the design. Here is the relocation of Building 30. It has always been aligned with Slipway 4 but now it will be a little bit closer in and will serve as a -- will serve as more of a gatekeeper or a signage function, which we think is a proper treatment for a sort of comparatively minor contributor to the district; it's still does date from the World War II period.

And we also have the reorientation of some of the playground elements and other park elements to reinforce the primacy of Slipway 4 as the central spine.

We really like the relocation of Crane 14 out to the outer end. We think that it does a fantastic job of just conveying the enormous scale of the slipway by having the cranes further apart. We also think that it enhances the visibility of the park and the attractiveness of the park by aligning it with 18th Street. It really makes the historically industrial nature of the whole area more legible from a great distance away.

And the last thing I wanted to say was just that as I alluded to with Slipways 1, 2 and 3 and also with the rail lines, you know, I talked about the contributors. There are a lot of elements on the site that don't have enough integrity to be considered contributors to the National Register District but they still imbue the whole area with a unique historic character. And we like how the design incorporates so many of those elements, while you can't call them contributors, to produce the unique feel of Crane Cove Park.

And I'll hand this now off to -- there you are.

MS. DUSOLIER: Thank you. I'll run through the landscape concept. A little bit of the history of how we evolved the design to the way it is today. As David described, it has been a process that has followed a lot of different steps. We have received a lot of public input throughout the process as well as board comments that have been critical to make some of the adjustments and changes that you see today. So we thought we think actually we have basically been able to improve the park significantly with some of the feedback received to date.

As a reminder. From the very get-go of the project we have been focusing on responding to business goals that incorporate all of the elements that we feel are unique to this place. They are important to be remembered and they need to be incorporated in any park today but in particular historic preservation. Obviously, providing a balance of permanent activities within the concept of the waterfront and within the project itself. And also in connection to adjacent and further away (indiscernible).

Making sure that the park design goes forward but it will not design, per se, the parcels that are to be developed. Making sure that the park responds to those appropriately. And then looking at a reasonable approach and respectful approach for sustainability going from the point of view of sea level rise and stormwater management, et cetera.

For those of you who weren't with us in the meeting in June, from the very beginning we have always been talking what makes this park unique is the fact that we need to somehow find this perfect balance or this marriage that celebrates the history of the site and but at the same time needs to be completely reinvented for a use that was never meant to be part of its history, basically. As Matt was describing, all of the elements that you see today, that you saw when we were walking around, were meant for a factory to make ships, not for recreation. But the opportunity of the part we are overseeing is actually marrying those two things.

And we have studied a lot of the history of the site in a lot of different ways but one of the things that we find that is always quite remarkable is how -- or very inspirational I should say -- for the design of the park is we have the objects that are present that we can all look at. But what is interesting or we put it as our challenge as we started talking to all the stakeholders is how do you remember a little bit the character of the site, how this place used to be used?

And this picture in particular I find quite remarkable because it really sort of highlights during the World War II era, which is the features that we see today on the site, how it was used. All the different ways that the system was organized so every single space at the site was used for a specific purpose; to organize materials, to build the ships, et cetera.

At this point in time, Slipways 1, 2 and 3, as you can see, they were no longer used for shipbuilding, they were already almost functioning as some sort of deposition location, in a way. And the core or the center of the park or the site, a unique location where there was actually for the workers - that was where they had the washrooms - and so it's slightly different than all of the other areas that function as a way to provide with building the ships.

And again these sort of like -- these sort of two elements have been key into understanding how we designed this park.

So for some of you who were at the very beginning of this project, this is way back in 2012 when we established the very, very foundation of what this park was about. And we said for example, we have the slipway in the center, the main character, we have the two cranes as

our defining elements. And then we have the city that comes at this stage above the level of the park so we are disconnected.

So one of the first questions that we asked is we have two options into sort of how we connect this park. In order to make it a real recreational resource we have to be able to get to it very easily. So one approach was to say, leave everything as is, very lightly touch it with almost putting a bridge approach. So basically the site goes under and this is what the diagram begins to reflect.

And we had a second alternative at the stage of alternatives. We were saying the second approach we can take is to say the way to connect to the city is to really sort of grade the site in some strategic manner to provide or amplify the access and at the same time respect some of the elements. But we are at that time, way back then, in '12 we were calling it almost like the Pompeii archeological approach.

(Laughter.)

MS. DUSOLIER: Uncover some of the resources and remember them and highlight or use this new thing that comes in to highlight some of the resources before.

With each one of those two approaches actually we did two completely different alternatives, one was called the traces because we were really fascinated with what if we were to trace every single thing that was on the site, and then we decided to overlap those and figure out what then begins to emerge. How do we utilize some of the things that we see today and the things that are no longer out there.

We then prepared a second alternative in which we were using -- let's use the approach of -- I mean, modifying them slightly. Transforming some of the resources. And in this case instead of only focusing on the elements, what if we were to study more the activities that took place in-between the objects and see if those could become inspiration for then developing a park program.

So, for example, we were saying, in the slipway, which is the area where everything was building after that image that I showed you, that is the assembly point. And say, well, maybe that would suggest that as a park use, that is a big gathering area. So we started using that as a way to inspire ourselves to figure out how to match the new program with some of the spaces created by a big factory. And we follow a similar process, sort of overlapping, in this case, again focusing more on the spaces in-between.

What came out of this process was really what became our park that we are -- we have been presenting. So in a way we took, based on a lot of feedback that we received and looking at all the opportunities that came out for those two very, very good approaches, we took the approach of covering the site a little, filling that area to create easier access, and in the same time basically building -- remembering the traces that were physically on-site. Forget about overlapping all the lines, they're already gone. And instead focusing on the elements we do have. And then use the spaces in-between to remember again some of those programs.

But after we met with you guys in June one of the things that actually -- some of the comments that we received asked us to refocus on one thing that I think has always been part of the equation and yet, I think, this new opportunity to look at our design allowed us to focus even more.

Which is the cool thing about this park called Crane Cove Park. Obviously we did not come up -- I did not come up with that name but I love it, because Crane Cove Park somewhat remembers a little bit what this park is about. "Crane" has sort of -- we have all these physical historic elements in place. Every siting we always say -- every siting any place in the city has a history. What normally you don't have is the advantage of having the actual objects still present in there, so that's a great opportunity and (someone coughing) possibility, as (indiscernible) would say.

The second aspect obviously is the cove. And this is the element that I think we have been really focusing a lot on how do we marry some of the historic elements with the new program. And I think taking a little bit of the cove is a given. So I think in this new iteration that is one of the focuses or one of the changes that I think came out of the June meeting, as Matt was describing. Sort of new water access.

So I'll walk you through a little bit of what is, what is the process of the design that some of the pieces that were settled as I was describing earlier, based on those two big positions of those two alternatives and then some of the new evaluation based on feedback received recently.

So as I was saying, after going through the alternatives process one of the things that came out to the surface was that the access that was more connecting throughout the whole site was preferred. So the first thing that we did on the project was really set up how do we grade that element but at the same time highlight our resource, our main element, our main character, and then using the new fill as an opportunity to create almost like a new vantage point for the site.

That basically led us to the equation that honestly the whole site should be about celebrating this slipway. How the two sides, even though -- even historically and physically today they are so different, different in scale, different in orientation, different in the connection to the city, somehow we needed to find something to connect them.

And of course there's all the historic elements that are on the top of our site that helps us dictate how and when this large blue zone can be interpreted in different ways. So we do celebrate and highlight the slipway but at the same time recognize that potential of slightly different personalities as you go around the park and enjoy them and remember the history of them.

As I was mentioning, this is Crane Cove Park. So this time around in this new version we looked back again to, okay, so what are the basic, more interesting destinations on the shore that we really want to emphasize. And so we basically have many opportunities to connect to the water but there's actually four that have always -- looking at all of our feedback from community and understanding our site -- have been very relevant.

The Ramp Restaurant is overlook -- it's where we started our tour today, for those who were with us. Obviously the edge of Slipway 4, that is really the point where you really are at the center of the cove.

And then there is the amazing theater of the ship repair facility that it is, you know, in a weird way, this incredible resource that doesn't exist anywhere else. Sort of getting a way to sort of look into that.

We have always looked at Slipway 4 and this edge of the cove as most -- easier or a more logical way to connect to the water in and out. And then now we are basically started looking at all these other overlook opportunities responding to that. And that gave us what you see now as a sort of this new element that responded to a lot of the suggestions from this Board and other people to really create a zone that you can walk along the water then allowing then this zone of the park to really engage more of a natural connection to the water and then the more recreational connectivity in that way.

But one of the other things that has been very, very prevalent in our discussions with everybody is all of the history and the layout and all the overtoppings basically give us a diagram of how the space can be organized. But on top of that or next to it or within it there is always a question about how you maintain the historic character. What this new life of the project will do to actually preserve some of not only the materials and the artifacts themselves but also this notion of the scale and how you -- from one side of the slipway to the other there's actually very different connections to the Bay and the City.

So very early in the project we had devised the idea that the whole park, the landscape itself, the use of planting could be a way to link the two things. It was really very early in the project where we were talking about in historic places when you look at the plantings it's almost like -- the High Line in New York right now has, for those of you who know the project, it's a historic railyard that everybody loves because it has a lot of designed planting. And the decision to provide this planting came from not only remembering the historic element but the part that -- what all those years it was abandoned. So much planting so they just grew naturally. And so our site, in a way, has that opportunity to take the approach to manage the planting in there to have a little bit of that more sensitive to this roughness or this character, this grit that gets at real life.

But very strongly we heard from a lot of the community members that they really wanted to have an area to enjoy and have, you know, play areas and lawns to run and et cetera, et cetera. So what we were proposing and we have been proposing is always that within the site we feel that there is enough room, enough scale to provide instead of a consistent, say, landscape around to highlight the slipway itself as an element, that there could be a gradation. Something that speaks of the fact that this landscape sort of surrounds and highlights the slipway in a way in contrast because it was never planted before.

But really responding to the fact that adjacent to, I guess, the street to be more -- you know, what we were calling manicured space. And as you move into the space and you discover more of the other areas, that core here where we have Buildings 110, Building 50 and 109, kind of the grit builds back up. And so you can really enjoy the fact that this is not all perfectly manicured throughout. But at the same time respecting the idea that it should, basically, highlight our main character, which is Slipway 4.

So this is our current diagram, I guess. And I'll just walk you through some of the areas to describe a bit how this place looks like, some of the programs that are included, to give you a sense of how the scale responds and further responses to scale and use at the site.

So one of the things that you can observe here is that idea that I was describing that the slipway is preserved as an open space, without almost any planting but that the planting around it basically begins to frame it and highlight it. So in introducing this new space or this

new level of improvement that never existed we are actually trying to provide two things, one is an enjoyable environment where people can actually sit and look at the beach but at the same time sort of highlight our resources on-site.

So this is the plan we have been looking at again. What are the changes that you notice from the last time we met in June. There is a modification of this, grading is very dramatic, sort of outlook/overlook sort of focusing on the shipyard itself. This is a piece of Slipway 1 that currently is completely crumbling, for those of you who were on the site, that we will not repair. But the element in that seat will be built and allow for that decay to happen over time and you practically become part of the witness of it.

And then the green surrounding the slipway, that Plaza that we were describing before. Slipway Park with Keel Park in the middle with these movable keel blocks reused for play, sitting, picnicking, et cetera.

The urban beach. And obviously the zone that combines the amazing resources; 109 is a park element that extends into and connects to 110.

If you look at the area of the site again, what I was saying is if you go from an area close to the street that is a little bit more manicured by that -- and as you move into the site the materials that we use, the way that we are recycling some of the elements that existed on the site, I guess we are building up the grit.

So we have a quick fly-through to the site. We felt that one of the trickiest things on this project is to actually express how we are understanding the scale and how as you move around the space you basically -- the slipway becomes a connector at the same time a divider. And that's always been the case. That was the destination for building ships but it was also another way to organize the space. So it was oriented that way because of the shape of the cove to be able to float the ship when it was built.

And so I think for us one of the main elements that I think we heard loud and clear from the last meeting is the sort of concern about making sure that it doesn't feel like too fragmented of a space. But as you probably experienced walking onto the site today, the presence of Slipway 4 allows you to have this very dramatic component to watch the water. But the two sides of it, to a certain degree, can afford to have slightly different characters and personalities and we really then celebrate the before and the after that we think is worth having as part of the park.

So inside Slipway 4 itself there is an existing unpaved zone on the edge so we hope to provide some planting that is very small so it doesn't take over the, the utility rack. The utility racks themselves become a frame to it.

Building 30 is brought closer to the main runway, which is basically taking you all the way to the future urban beach in an area where you can launch your kayak, et cetera. So it forms a very distinct edge.

The cove itself for many, many years before it was in its current configuration always had more water on that edge. So the urban beach actually follows the latest shape of that area on the cove.

This is the space in-between. This is Building 110 so basically Building 109 is to our left. This is where Building 110 will have the opportunity to become the restrooms of the park and a

café. So if you can imagine that space really sort of lending itself to a little bit of a peace and quiet to observe the big ships that will be on your right and to look at the big cranes on the left.

And these are the fields that we think the idea here is to have a planting that starts with maybe a "no-mow" area where we have places where people can run and play. And then you can switch the transition in that into that more interactive, sort of leaving shore condition. And this is that pathway that takes you all the way to this new overlook that we are basically extending in front of the runway of Slipway 4.

Then you can walk along this pathway that provides some elevation for sea level rise protection and it takes you all the way to basically creating this little overlook where the edge of Slipway 1 will basically eventually decay, so you might end up with just an overlook over the years. And in the meantime you can basically enjoy the dramatic views of the ships that actually keep moving and changing.

The idea of a temporary use for that Slipway 1, as David was describing on the site, maybe a dog park that can be used up until that Slipway is not usable.

So you can begin to see the -- again, the characters of the green sort of change as you move into the site but they really embrace and bracket, basically, the Slipway 4 and that's basically what we are hoping to do to celebrate all the resources that we have. So.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

MS. DUSOLIER: So just a look at some of the potential programs. One of the changes that you see here today, as we were describing, we used it for a playground and another playground here. Based on your feedback we have modified them to actually continue to run along the edge.

For those of you who were on the site tour wondering how is this grading really happening. So basically this is 19th Street as it currently exists, this is Illinois. So as we basically build this new access to the park, which is a new 19th Street comes down, we have about a drop of, you know, almost six feet by the time you get to the edge of the slipway. So the existing grade of the slipway is about zero. So we are basically slowly grading this down to five percent so you can enter without any -- so this is all walkable without any steps.

Then there is another opportunity then to basically very mellow connect the site to create an opportunity for this space. So as we are filling we basically use those (indiscernible) as Matt was describing. So the current edge of the slipway that ends in the current runway is the edge of what we are calling the World War II slipway edge.

The World War Slipway edge 3, basically mapped it out, of all of those traces that we were getting into before and we used that as our limit to create a little validated platform. And one of the ideas with the fill, both at the lawn and this, is, again, to use this idea that it is very much more manicured so that it's very obvious that this is an addition. So nobody will get confused about, is that how it historically looked like, how does this work? And what's what we were trying to sort of emphasize in the idea of landscape. That when you come to the site you will be very clear that the edge from close to Illinois is introduced and everything else is preserved and restored and a little bit recycled.

So this is a view -- basically standing on some of those steps. You can see the main runway. This is a main connection to the blue greenway so this is 30 feet wide. As you can see

today, that dimension is given by the width of the ramp -- I mean the crane. So then it basically remembers this location.

And then we use Building 30 almost as a billboard, as a community bulletin board.

Again, another view of a crane, a crane car. That's crane plaza, I'm sorry. The keel blocks used inside of the slipway to allow for other -- more movable. As the sea rises potentially those blocks can be moving upland.

And then we have these connections to allow people to get into the slipway and a ramp area for dropping your kayak.

So these are the two. So you come from one of the walks, you can ramp back and up as you can see here. So Crane 30 is moved forward so then you can really come in, step down, get into the slipway, go up and then continue. So that big arc that I was showing. When you encounter Slipway 4 it takes you into the slipway and out around. And we used the crane so we can celebrate or highlight that connection point.

This is the story about the keel blocks and how we hope to recycle them and reinterpret them on the site. We did a lot of very initial conceptual ideas of how you -- somehow many remember -- celebrate the idea of how the ships were built over the years and so there was assembling and stacking, et cetera, et cetera. That became our -- a little bit our main way of organizing this phase.

And we looked into, is there any way to remember some of the actual ships that were built in this shipyard? And we landed at the current conclusion that the Master Plan where we talk about this sort of keel line within the big expanse of concrete within the slipway we can actually trace those three actual ships that were built at some point in time and really sort of give you this dramatic connection to the water. And then use, again, Building 30 to explain some of those things. Building 30 has this big three, sort of, gates or doors so you can see. So then they become integral to how the ship --

Again, the idea that there were all these sort of layers of the site that we can remember and celebrate. This is a new idea for integrating the playground more as a linear element that connects to the big -- becomes a little transition between the runway and the lawn.

Then the central area with Building 109 with some thoughts about parking, storage for kayaks and other small human-powered vessels.

And the idea of incorporating some relics that the Port currently owns. There is this boat that was actually discovered in one of -- the construction of one of the high-rises downtown that the Port owns that can be actually used right now, stored in one of the sheds along the waterfront. So that the idea is to sort of use Building 109 as both the more pragmatic uses of parking and some of the -- in interpretation of some of these other elements. So you can see that.

This is also the main, very dramatic public access. For those of you who were on the site you can see the character of this building is quite dramatic. And the idea is that the building functions as a big gateway. So you go through the building all the way across straight to the overlook, which is the outermost point on the cove.

This is the area where we do have all of those traces of traps that we want to incorporate and we have the two buildings close enough that we don't want a more tighter space. This is

really an area where you can -- we see -- you can sit and really enjoy the view of the historic ship building on the former shipyard and the current walk beyond in the current shipyard here.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Could you begin to wrap up, please.

MS. DUSOLIER: This is our view. We have developed a planting. Some more views. This is going to be up to the playgrounds, incorporating them and making them connect to some of the existing elements. (Indiscernible) all the way from Slipway 1. You can see the fields across. And then this new overlook built on top of sort of some of the relics extending the runway.

Some ideas for Building 49 as an aquatic center.

And the main connection to the beach, where basically you will drop or use it as a launch for kayaks.

So we have a lot of more specifics about all of those things as we go into the Q&A we'll be happy to expand more on those. But at least that gives you a good sense of, I hope, of where we started, where we landed and how we used the feedback to improve the site.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

(Applause.)

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Before we begin the audience comments I am going to ask our Design Review Board, are there any specific questions you would like answered before we go forward?

DRB MEMBER EPHRAIM HIRSCH: I'll start at the end, if I may. I had several questions just for my own clarification and I hope for the group as well. Early on one of the slides showed a channel demarcation, you know, fictional of course, of where the human-powered boats would be restricted to. I'm just wondering, will there be a line of wands or something placed in the water to guide that?

I notice that in the Exhibit 7 the crane that was on the left side, the one that moves forward to the water, is shown oriented in line with the slipway rather than at right angles as shown in the previous submissions and also the 3D renderings. I'm just wondering, was that a decision to -- that you didn't like the idea of it framing the view, that it interrupted the view or is it something just you thought about, maybe the framing?

Cutting the line back at Slips 1, 2 and 3, you know, on the diagonal, I think that's a fine thing. I just wonder, does that move the Hunter Cliff BCDC line to the south and we get a little more area that we are involved with?

Item E in the notes says -- let's see here. "Desire to understand the development parcels." And the comment there was, "COMING SOON" in caps. So my question is, what's (inaudible).

This maybe Cheryl can answer this but I'll raise the questions. Have native plants that do not require so much irrigation or mowing been considered and what type of trees are you proposing?

And the final item that just caught my eye in that 3D moving representation, showing a fence all along the edge of the site. And I realize there are safety issues, liability issues, et cetera, but I know many piers in San Francisco have just raised -- not bollards (phonetic). What do you call the horizontal --

SPEAKER: Oh, bull rails.

SPEAKER: Bull rails, thank you. That may be in many places the -- those blocks that were used as -- you showed scattered on the site. That maybe they could be used as a barrier rather than a fence so as not to interrupt the view. I mean, it may be a light, transparent fence but it's still a fence that will prevent full visual access and enjoyment. So those are my questions.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay. Can we hold further questions because time is going.

MR. HIRSCH: Sorry, I didn't mean to take it all up.

(Laughter.)

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: And what I'd like to do now is --, because we really want to hear the audience, all of you who came out. So would it be a good idea to go from, like, front to back and just go row by row. Those who wish to speak just raise your hand as we come to each new row.

So in the first row is all the presenters so this is the first row. Yes, please. And could you state your name and try to keep your remarks from, you know, no more than three minutes and we can get out of here.

MR. SKAFF: I will do my best.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay.

MR. SKAFF: Thank you very much. My name is Richard Skaff. I have spent the last week going through the volumes of -- I found out about the Crane Cove Park project because I receive the BCDC mailings.

And I have recently gone through a life change, I am now living out of the San Francisco Bay area, I'm living up in Guerneville, so I haven't been paying as much attention as I should have been to the BCDC mailings or any other work-related documents.

But when I started looking at first the BCDC documents and then the San Francisco Port documents I became very interested. I don't -- I believe most of you probably don't know me. I worked for the City of San Francisco for 15 years, the last position was Deputy Director of the Mayor's Office for Disability, which I opened for Willie Brown. And I started the first program in 1989 as a Chief Building Inspector under Dianne Feinstein and worked for five mayors. And during the 15 years I was with the City my focus was on, first, California Building Code Title 24, the 24th section of the California Building Code related to access. And since 1991 the requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act, the accessibility now are called (indiscernible).

I have a number of concerns, John, and I appreciate the opportunity for the site review and (background conversations overpower the speaker.) Because a site review will help people understand the volume of the project and the size of the project and what it encompassed, which is not easy to (indiscernible). I'm not saying the comments weren't good but it's just being there makes a difference.

And you don't have to answer now, David, or the folks from BCDC. What, you know -- All of the documents talk about the planning process, which is the way City projects go, they have to go through a planning process and that's acceptable. What I found in 15 years with the City and I continue to find is that those difficult groups, those people with architecturally -- and getting them to meetings are people with disabilities and quite often seniors, older seniors.

And I bring up those two groups mainly because they are the hardest part of our community public to design for. The design for functional access is much more detailed than it is for general public access because of our functional -- they way they function is quite different.

And in none of the documents that I have read, either through BCDC Design Review or first with, of course, the Port with their outreach, any specific effort to meet and discuss with those two communities as broadly as they could be talked to about the design as it relates to accessibility. And I'll relate very quickly a couple of things that come to mind that are really basic in the documents I read.

(Tone.)

MR. SKAFF: Oops.

MS. MIRAMONTES: That's about three minutes. If you can just make your -- make your -- main points.

MR. SKAFF: I have got a list and I've got to speak to these folks because I'm coming in at the end of the design planning process, which might be even too late.

SPEAKER: Keep going.

MR. SKAFF: Bicyclists seem to have a huge part of this, which is a good thing, but, you know, here's 25 percent of your population in San Francisco and throughout the country that are people with disabilities, not including seniors, and we're having -- we're having an aging population that will have ambulation issues, hearing issues, vision issues and cognitive issues. There was nothing in any of the documents that I could find dealing with blindness, dealing with mobility, accessibility or those same issues as they relate to seniors.

For example, there was a brief discussion about signage. You look at signage, the historic informational historic signs along the Embarcadero roadway that were put in to educate and inform the public a number of years ago when we tore down the freeway and opened that up and made a beautiful pathway that a blind person has no access to, absolutely no access to it. Very important information but there is no information for people that are blind.

People with vision issues. We have amphitheaters created that blend with the grass ring. Very pretty. What happens when a person who is blind walks off one of those elevation levels? There is not a detectable warning on there. Or for a senior with limited vision that has elevation issues, they won't see the change in elevation and could walk off and fall.

That's why we have in the California Building Code a requirement for exterior stairs. And these are being called stairs although they are not code stairs. We have a requirement for a contrasting stripe at the edge so that people will understand that there's a drop-off.

What I am getting to, including the boating. This boating facility is either a beach, which I can't get access to. There was no discussion in anything I saw about creating a pathway, a wooden raised deck pathway like I created after the '89 earthquake when we got FEMA funding at the San Francisco Marina when the FEMA funds paid for the marina seawall. And there was no access down to that beach. We now have access there.

We have existing rails. We have decomposed granite being proposed. Look at the Crissy Field granite; the decomposed granite use failed.

SPEAKER: So if you maybe just make one --

MR. SKAFF: What I -- what I'm getting to in this broad list of issues is the absolutely inadequate, absolutely inadequate process to include the concerns and needs of a whole, very large portion of our population.

And, you know, I wouldn't be so strident about it if this were just the first or second time. This is a brand new, 45 or some-odd million dollar project and I am here by myself. And I understand, you know, it's a difficult site. I was told by David in his e-mail to me that the site was not accessible, it was mostly not accessible. But there are ways that our community could have been approached.

I started the South Beach Bay Area Association of Disabled Sailors. Have they been part of this? Have they been asked in the questionnaires what they think of the beach access or of concrete with -- I guess they're blocks with gravel in them to get down into the water on the far side. Is that a boat slip or is it just putting your boat in the water at the end of the ramp?

SPEAKER: No, we haven't gotten to that.

MR. SKAFF: You haven't gotten to that. Well that's an important issue. If you go to Pier 39 in the very near future -- and I don't know, Ellen, whether that's been started. Has it had its final review and approval by BCDC?

MS. MIRAMONTES: No.

MR. SKAFF: Well they're proposing to put in a brand new kayak dock, which I believe will be one of the most accessible in the Bay. So those are the things that need to happen and they haven't happened.

And I'm disappointed at both of them, the initiating agency level and the BCDC level. And I'm hoping that both agencies will start making that at the beginning a priority.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: We hear you and we will try to accomplish that.

MR. SKAFF: I'm sorry I took so long.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Anybody else in this row or should we go to the next row?

Let's go to Row 3 then. Starting at the end.

MS. BROWNELL: I have come to a number of meetings over time. My name is Gail Brownell and I'm with South End Rowing Club. Which is no longer at the south end, it's actually at the north end of the city near Aquatic Park. But it was once down here and I row, regularly row in this direction and sometimes go to The Ramp, et cetera.

And I think in general speaking, for folks who do water sports this place would be another great spot and will really increase the activity of the sport, that kind of thing. I think a lot of the public will totally stock up and get there -- and there are handicapped access ramps by the way that were put in so there's things that continue to be done to make it a really good, accessible place and I'm really excited about just having this go forward.

I love the historic design, I think that's pretty cool, the history. I know a lot of work has gone into that. I'm excited to see this keep moving forward. Thanks.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. Go ahead, please.

SPEAKER: Hi, James Neudenbacher (phonetic). I am seeing most of this in person for the first time although I've reviewed things on-line and I have had a couple of meetings with different fragmented neighborhood groups over the past a bit.

And it seems that a lot of things have happened since the first couple of meetings. And I know that early in the meetings that the notes were always -- somewhere there was a theme of fragmentation, needing unified design and all this sort of thing.

What struck me particularly today is that, especially on the slide show, was the sort of -- I don't even know what to say, you know. This large, apparently private, residential development, private residential development literally 30 feet from the urban beach. Which is sort of shocking, it seems unprecedented in San Francisco. So I am very, very surprised to see something like that. That, in fact, the whole site seems to be split up by this very large, I guess, condominium building right in the middle of it, literally on the beach, which is shocking. I don't think anything has been built like that. It's like building a building right on Ocean Beach or something. It seems a little bit crazy, especially when looking at the plan that we have here in front of us, this urban beach and a very large condominium building literally on top of it.

So any kind of openness or lines of sight to the park, to the new cranes location would be blocked, shadows would be there. I mean, it's endless. So that's absolutely shocking to me and all the people that I've met with in the neighborhood. So I'd like to hear that addressed very directly.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

MR. SCHWARTZ: My name is Bill Schwartz and I live at 18th and Illinois. My concern is sort of along those lines. I just don't understand why we would be building block -- big block buildings, fairly high in density block buildings of relatively high -- well the heights are unknown at this point and I think those should be specified before we approve the plan. So what exactly --

We're talking specifically at this case about that proposed development site and then there's some further south on that same side of Illinois where we don't know the height and it's going to block the view of the beach, of the park. Essentially it doesn't integrate with the park.

And when I asked at one point about the building in the park I was told it's not in the park, but that's really -- that's not an honest, an honest response because it's sitting right in the park. And you can draw a line around it if you like but it's there.

And it's not integrated into the park. Sometimes when you have a historic site you build buildings that are -- have a similar scale and a similar feel to them. But there is no illusion to the idea of that being done. So if you were going to put some modern condominium of relatively high height right in front of that beach in that case, and further south in front of --

SPEAKER: Could you stop going through and just keep one image on?

SPEAKER: We're trying to get an image that's appropriate for this discussion.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yeah. So I just don't think that the integration of those development sites has been thought about. And they're just, just a big intrusion into a park. It seems absurd to me to be building condominiums in a park, any more than you would build it in Golden Gate Park. Thanks.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. Next.

MS. LEVINE: Is that me?

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Yes.

MS. LEVINE: My name is Toby Levine and I have been involved in this project since it's very, very beginning. I am the co-chair of the Central Waterfront Advisory group.

I would like to say I think this is come to have -- this has come a very, very long way and I would say that I am, you know, 99 percent -- well, maybe not that high 90 percent satisfied.

But, and I do think this gentleman that came to us with the concerns from the disabled community and the elderly community, of which I am a member, I think he is very right. And I think that -- I think that this is an issue that can be looked at and looked at carefully.

And like we have looked very carefully with the human-powered boat community to try to make certain that that community was going to be able to use this facility in an appropriate and happy way, I think we need to probably do exactly the same thing with the disabled community. But I don't think it necessarily would be that hard a thing to do, I really don't.

The other thing on this potential building footprint. I realize that that building footprint gets everybody upset. You know, what's going to be there, is it intruding on the park? But, you know, so is The Ramp, so is the Kneass Building and so is Building 49, of which we need to have.

So I think that people need to kind of look at the fact that the Port needs the money to build the park, they don't have the money in their pockets yet. And they need to look at what they think will be an acceptable use for a development site and what it needs to look like. And in order to do that, if you're not satisfied with what you see here then you look at other places that have been successful in integrating a new building into an older type of development.

So I think that -- I think that probably the best thing to do is to start having some questions or talks about how could that building be appropriate for this park and what would it be? What would its height be and what would be sensible, what would be our guidelines? And not just say, oh, I don't like having a building there at the edge of this park. Because you won't be able to get the park if there is not some funding developed.

And I think that it can be made or become a useful building that some of the people are happy with as long as we are willing to discuss its shape, its materials, its potential uses. This is the first time, by the way, I have heard about a condominium, but that doesn't mean that it's not there. But I think we need to have more discussion about that particular site and not just make a lot of assumptions.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

MS. LEVINE: Anyway, I like most of this.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Next row.

MS. DELANEY: Hi, I'm Topher Delaney and I built a model after our last meeting so that I could understand the process of what this really was. I met with Boris Dramov, who could not be here, and I am going to represent two -- not so much -- I mean, I'll represent what Boris shared with me and then I'm going to talk about briefly my sort of horror at this whole development.

One of the things that I find in the presentation to be extremely disingenuous is that here we have a presentation that has not shown this building at all. So you cannot give a presentation that simply focuses on one small aspect of a \$45 million project. It is basically disingenuous, it fools the public and we have essentially been fooled. And I think it is disgraceful that we are in this position and that we, a tiny little group, are literally raising our hand for the future.

This building is outrageous. That you would sell your waterfront because the Port is not managed fiscally. I'm sorry, too bad, you know. Do better.

And the other, the Kneass Building. It's absolutely falling apart. I talked to Joe Cassidy (phonetic) who leased this and he started laughing. He said, it is absolutely not savable. There are termites every year. I put the roof on. It is not salvageable.

So, I mean, here is a beach privatized by a condominium. Is that where we want to go in San Francisco? Is that our vision? Who? I mean, what are we talking about here? Privatizing beaches for 50 feet? This is 50 feet. It could be 69 feet. This is so outrageous.

And then down here we never see any development. It's never shown. This is this lovely presentation by Alma. Never shown. Are we told that this is not the whole development that you have just seen? It's not because we only have sections being developed. All those beautiful pictures you saw are not part of this phase. So there you are making decisions on phases that are not being built. I mean, this is obfuscating fact and it is not a good way to proceed.

The other aspect of this is that the actual design I think is very concealed and extremely expensive. I was told by you, David, that 19th was something that the street would be accessed for the Boat -- for the Boat Works. Well I actually talked to the head of the Boat Works and he said, actually that road causes me some problems. So you tell me one thing, someone else tells me another. What is the truth here? Why is 19th being built? And why in the first phase are we using our money to build a road that basically is going to serve Forest City? So I think this is outrageous.

Okay, so I am going to read Boris Dramov's:

Remove the Kneass Building as it is completely unsalvageable according to Joe Cassidy of Granite Construction who was a former tenant. At a later date if there is some reason on which to locate the form of this building to another location then do so. Delete the proposed waterfront development parcel directly in front of the (indiscernible) property as it's currently located, to another location in the south.

That would be this building to the south more.

Retain and integrate the small park to the south of The Ramp with the renovated park. Develop an access beach in a different configuration reflecting an integration with the historic use of industry and the current intended use of recreation. So in the beach we had an image that I can relate to.

SPEAKER: I want to get to it, sorry, sorry, sorry. I just wanted to put the plants in there, okay.

MS. DELANEY: Thank you. So remove this, develop this site as Phase 1 here. Mr. Dramov said that they have just completed a project very similar for \$5 million instead of 20 or \$45 million.

So take this as your first phase. Forget this as your first phase. Go to this phase and do that first so that in point of fact the beach can be accessed by people. Not hard when you think about it.

From a civic perspective, the projected cost of the current developed Master Plan of \$45 million far exceeds the benefits for public amenities as the actual green space of the lawn is, are you ready for this, one-and-a-half acres of sloping lawn, that's a very big percentage.

Adjacent to the plaza, which is adjacent to the proposed extension of 19th, purportedly for the use of semi-trucks serving the BAE shipyard, this is a pitiful amount of land for public amenities given the extraordinary cost of development far outweighing any conceivable public benefit.

The actual design of the Master Plan does not integrate the context of the unique scale and history of this waterfront site. The Master Plan that is now conceived is an aggregate of small design interventions, which is -- the Plan is a diminutive vision reflecting constraints rather than opportunities. That is Boris' mantra.

Roma Design Group, as I said, has done a park for \$5 million. Deny approval for this Master Plan.

Here I have signatures from the community. I have 100 signatures, which I have just gotten. Most of these people are leaders and none of them want this, so here they are. So it isn't a group that really is behind this.

And I'll just read a little bit about an opinion piece which is going to be published in the Potrero News.

The current design for Crane Cove Park development has maintained historic forms of the cranes themselves but has failed to respect the historic relationship of the site, which imbues meaning and memory for a community to reflect upon their extraordinary history of industry.

The shifting of grades to accommodate patches, which I think is interesting because that is what the name was of this presentation. Patches of lawn, erases the raw and elemental aspect of such a site, rendering the site a Disneyland of sanitized history.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

Anyone else in this Row 4? Go ahead.

MR. LAVIGANO: Yeah, hi. My name is Michael Lavigano. I'm an architect but I would like to speak strictly on the basis of a new, a relatively new, recent resident of the Dogpatch.

And just would like to applaud the work that has been done to date. I think in the interest of time I would like to highlight one thing that I think is, you know, very interesting. In that the -- you know, those of us who move to the Dogpatch generally do not -- have done so because we are not so enamored with the overly manicured landscape but understand that on one side we need to have some of that.

But certainly the patina and the graduation of that from one side to the other I think is really, is really powerful. And the idea of having some erosion take place I think is very fitting in keeping that patina and maybe even some, you know, deposition of (indiscernible).

But the final just point I'd like to make is I think this is going to be an incredible asset to the neighborhood so as a resident I'd like to know how we could help support and move this forward as quickly as possible. Thank you.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

Anyone else in that row?

Okay, let's go to the next. Anybody in that row?

MS. GAFFNEY: I'm Maureen Gaffney with the San Francisco Bay Trail Project.

And I just want to say this is really an exciting project and it's great to be able to have gotten out on the site for a tour so thank you for everybody who arranged that, it makes such a difference for everybody who has been involved and wanting to talk on it.

I was actually going to say that usually when we, Bay Trail, are commenting on projects, you know, the usual mantra, whether it's Hunters Point Shipyard or any of the other developments around the Bay, the usual mantra is that, well, we have to do the development first then the public access is going to come later.

It's actually refreshing to me to see -- and I know that it does create some problems with the design and other issues but it is refreshing to actually see the public access coming first and the development trailing. Because it doesn't usually work that way. It's usually the public access and the Bay Trail, well, that's going to have to come later when we get the money. So I am actually encouraged to see that.

This is sort of -- this site is sort of reminiscent to me of Rosie the Riveter, a Bay Trail segment in Richmond which is just fantastic. It has really a rich history and it has current waterfront industrial uses that everyone can see. They're right there at the same time currently. The same thing at the Middle Harbor Shoreline Park in Oakland where you get to view right next to the berths with the huge ships in the water, the waterfront park environment.

This Crane Cove Park would be historic to the Bay Trail. The opportunity to depart from the side on Illinois where you can get actually to the water, which are really important pieces, especially down here on the southern waterfront where, you know, if your landing is on Illinois you don't have that opportunity to get to the water because of actively important maritime uses so that's going to be really great to have that opportunity here.

Obviously the mission of the Bay Trail is to have a path along the shoreline. The path around the Bay is about 65 percent complete, so that's 330 out of 500 miles, so the easy parts are done. And it's projects like this one that create Crane Cove Park, Agua Vista Park, Pier 43 and others, these are the ways that the Bay shore is moving incrementally towards the shoreline in places where it is not already on the shore.

And again, just the views of the old, historical shipbuilding, this is really exciting so far. So we're really happy to see this going in. And thank you for making the change to make it a wider trail along the shore, we think that's really important. Looking forward to seeing it happen. Thank you.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. It's going to be longer and longer because don't forget, we have to talk too. So if we can go -- speed it up a little bit.

MR. O'GRADY: Matt O'Grady, I'm Executive Director of the San Francisco Parks Alliance. We are the independent partner to the entire city for all things parks, recreation and open space. And for a decade now we have been partnering with the Port and other government agencies, all involving the city's eastern waterfront to develop the division that is known as the Blue Greenway, which is the 13 mile long route along the City's entire eastern shore from the southern border all the way up to the AT&T ballpark. And we have been working with city agencies, community groups, neighborhood groups to form that common vision for the Blue Greenway and that includes Pier 70 and what is now becoming Crane Cove Park.

I just want to highlight one of the key accomplishments that we had recently was that we were the leading co-sponsor of the parks bonds last year that voters passed that included \$195 million of parks funding in the city, including about \$16 million specifically for the Blue

Greenway. The Port has been a key partner in the Blue Greenway project almost from its inception and this adoption is a central part of realizing that vision for the greenway.

Coming up with this plan, of course, involved an array of really tough tradeoffs between the historic preservation, sustainability of the site facing climate change, a need for open space and, of course, the need to use the site itself to generate some of the revenue to pay for that redevelopment.

How to figure out that ideal balance required a great deal of open, open engagement with the community through a very rigorous community engagement process. And we saw the Port pursue this with a series of meetings, many of you participated in those, they were very well-attended, and the current plan is the result of all of that community input. So we want to applaud the Port for that robust level of community engagement that they pursued. It has been a very thorough input process throughout the past year.

We are very supportive of the significant open space that is being included in the designs that are currently being considered as this plays forward.

We are also impressed and pleased with the array of recreational activities that are included. There are active recreation, passive recreation, playgrounds, a wide array of ways for people to recreate and make use of this space, which we are very supportive of it.

As the city continues to grow and as population density increases -- keep in mind that 30,000 new residents are going to be living down at Bayview/Hunters Point starting in about 20 years from now. We see a growing need for public open spaces and this will contribute to fulfilling some of that need.

A few key specifics that I want to draw your attention to is first off there's a lot of controversy over this potential development here. We do know that it's just a potential development. There are alternatives to move that to a different location on Pier 70. We strongly encourage the Port to consider -- to continue considering those alternatives.

I also wanted to note that there is a historic fence along this green that needs to stay there as part of the historic preservation, so we also are encouraging the Port to pursue creative design alternatives for designs or for signage to make sure that this park is as open and inviting as possible while we retain that fence.

So this is all really a key component to fulfilling the vision for the Blue Greenway so we strongly encourage that this moves forward.

I also just wanted to introduce you -- for anyone who wants to learn more about the Blue Greenway, our Blue Greenway manager, Ana Vasudeo is here, raise your hand Ana, so you'll be able to hit her up for information.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

We're really running out of time but I have to ask you, who is next? Okay, three more?

SPEAKER: No.

SPEAKER: No.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Four? That's another hour unless we can cut it.

SPEAKER: Well if we -- John, if you ask them to hold it tight to three minutes we'll make it.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay. Let's this last round, can people go to three minutes?

SPEAKER: And then we have to move on, we have to stay strict with the time then in order to make this a meaningful meeting where you can hear what --

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay. So when you hear the bell go off. Who would like to start?

SPEAKER: The gentleman in the purple shirt there.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay.

MR. WILSON: My name is Marcel Wilson. I am a licensed architect; I have a practice in San Francisco, I've practiced here for 13 years. I have been involved with planning urban waterfronts, internationally as well as in San Francisco, from Hunters Point to most recently the Fort Mason Center. This site --

For seven years I have been planning, actively planning the Blue Greenway. For seven years I have been actively assisting on the (indiscernible) focused on the eastern waterfront, almost on the border for San Francisco parks (inaudible).

And I will keep my comments focused. I am generally supportive of the project. I think it's moved a tremendous amount and it's done so diligently and carefully and inclusively.

I think at this point it has got a solid set of fundamentals. Every project will evolve and it will improve with each iterative step, as this one will. But it does have solid fundamentals on the urban scale, on the program and technically. Its alignment on the urban scale are thoughtful, there is generous access to the Blue Greenway along the runway and 19th Street, and the plan provides for connections to the facility -- connections and facilitates waterside access, which is hugely important but always under-represented.

On the technical issues. It's quite resolved topographically for what's appropriate at this stage of a project, the kinds of issues you would look at. Including, I would argue, ADA accessibility to the primary circulation routes and experiences that should be common to all. It's got a subtle response to sea level rise without muddying up the plan or being too heavy handed. And it makes design opportunities out of -- for a human experience out of the technical limitations, which are quite complicated and shouldn't be underestimated.

The program, it's found a generous set of (someone coughing at 1:38:54) between historic preservation and what's soft and what's hardscape, and that's a balance that will continue to evolve and make better renderings and stuff. It provides the type of open space and uses and program and they are in the right places and they respond to a lot of survey work that has been done on the Blue Greenway adjacent to (indiscernible).

In terms of the cost and the resources that are being assigned to this. If you start to pull out the historic preservation dollars it is actually very much in line with what you would spend on a post-industrial waterfront site complex, a post-industrial waterfront site. And I'm talking that's the actual, that's from a national perspective.

And while I am not convinced about the particular development at the site I am convinced that it does need to be a part of the project. It needs to be a part of the project for the park-serving uses as well as for the revenue source. The Port, you know, there's a revenue source --

(Tone.)

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. Who is next?

MS. O'LEARY: Hi, my name is Andrea O'Leary and I am mostly concerned about the Slips 1, 2 and 3. This is the first time I have heard about this idea of private condos and I have a personal aversion to any kind of building on our waterfront. I think that this kind of access should be open to all at all times.

But if you need the money, and I am not convinced you do. I think there are ways to fund these things without us having to leave a long-term compromise of the public access. But if you did, hey, Slips 1, 2 and 3 are total afterthoughts anyway. Build your condos over there. Put them on Slip 1 for God's sake. Tier them back so that they can have some sort of views or whatever.

If you're going to live here you're going to live in an industrial area, so put them there. Put them on Pier 70, put them somewhere else. The views of the beach, the access to the beach should be something that you know is (indiscernible) and it shouldn't have any sort of reason, money or otherwise, to be blocked off.

In their presentation I believe our presenter said something about Pier -- Slip 1 having sort of temporary use as a dog park, which has its contamination and other issues. You know, temporarily until some further developments. I don't know what that means. I don't know if they expect it to be underwater eventually. But it just seems to me that that sort of set back space is already in the middle of construction and development anyway. Put your private developments there and leave the waterfront, leave the access to the beach open to all. Thanks.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. Next?

MR. NIXON: My name is Paul Nixon. I've been a member of the Central Waterfront Advisory Committee since its inception in 1999.

I was looking at some of the old plans, the first one in 2001. Like boats in the pictures here. I am also a member of Bay Access, which is the group that brought the Water Trail, the Water Trail to the Bay Area.

In 1999 I had three projects that I was really interested in. One was the Water Trail. We got that through the legislature and the governor signed it.

The other was a kayak launch at Mission Beach and the boat building for the UC people. And we have that, we have a kayak launch there, very peaceful and beautiful boat building, things like that.

And so this is the last thing that I would like to finish up since I have been working on this since 1999.

I just think that we've gone through a lot of looking at things. We had to look at public trust issues, we did that for a year. We had to look at small boat issues versus the industrial area. We looked at that and I think we came to a compromise.

I think what we need to do is to look at the years between the end of World War II and the present. This is where the outrigger canoe people began, on Port land. Then they moved to Islais Creek and now they're over at Crissy Field.

Rowboats from the Dolphin Club and the South End Club come here all the time. Any human-powered boaters in the Bay Area, they always know The Ramp. Boats are coming to The Ramp all the time. And when we put human-powered boating here, which we will do, this isn't going to increase any of our problems here. They have always been here, they always should be here and I think that the plan is working fine as it is.

The main thing now is to go to completion and let's get this thing done. I mean, since 2001. Let's go, let's just do it.

MS. CAPINELLI: Hi, my name is Janet Capinelli. I live in Dogpatch and I have been involved in this also for many, many years.

Number one, I believe we should really get rid of that potential development site that is a -- it's a view blocker and it's, you know. We have a unique opportunity here to emphasize that beautiful little cove and extend it and use it for public access and public use from now until eternity. Yes, thank you very much.

So, I mean, I think it's just so small-minded to actually put development there. And I said it from day one when this project has been shown to us and I really think that is a very important thing to consider. So I really think, you know, 30 feet between a building and that little cove is just not enough, you've got to get rid of that building. We don't need to fund our parks by having that private development. We've done it before, built parks before, and we can do it again.

Secondly, I am not in favor of this grassy area and this building up of the site because I really think that totally takes away the ambiance and the integrity of the site from day one. I mean, I think it's really great to walk along Illinois Street and be able to look down on the site and see -- you can see much better how it was and it's interesting the way it is.

I think what we need to take is a very light approach to this development of this park and do the least amount that we can do and that's what is going to be most interesting. People, I don't know if you realize, but bayfront parks are all going to be green spaces and flat spaces and playgrounds and things like that. There's lots of those parks around, Mariposa Park on Mariposa next to the hospital is going to be another made park. There are so many parks that are just, you know, you can put anything there because there is nothing there now. Why are we, like, re-creating a grassy knoll when we don't need it?

What we need and what we should be celebrating and enjoying is what we have here. This is the kind of place where people get in there and you almost feel like you shouldn't be there because it's so interesting and so crazy. So why make it, you know, boring and something like we can see anywhere else. We should emphasize what we have now in the water, the hand-powered boating. Because that's what we should really emphasize. It's a really beautiful place to kayak. I kayak in there now myself. I walk around, I bike around, I think this is a fabulous place to really have an opportunity to make and keep it special, so we should not be diluting it with some of this crazy stuff that has been

And also too many trees. This is not a tree area. I don't know why we have trees here. That doesn't make any sense to me. I like the idea of a building that you walk through. It has a canopy, you can go in there if you want shade. Most of the time everybody is wanting sun. I mean, there's very few days like today when it's close to hot and you might not want to be out there. I just don't understand the idea of introducing a bunch of trees to this area. Thank you.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

MS. DEMENEY: My name is Katherine (phonetic) Demeney and I am a Dogpatch resident and I am here to talk about the potential development site as well.

I came to the May -- the June 10th -- no, it was a year ago. It was actually the design review when they first presented the three sketches and they showed the potential of all the

sites and there were two of them and they were basically lined in. And you could barely tell they were there, it was very deceiving. And I sort of said, well what's this? And they said, oh, those have planned years ago, this is how we're paying for everything.

And that's just crazy because you put them there forever and they're there. And we give away -- we are going to give away our future for a temporary quickening of the building of this park when really we should be saying, if we can't afford it today we should maybe just wait.

And I know you say, let's go ahead and do this, let's do this now. Well, what is the cost of doing it now when you can't afford it now? Why don't we just wait and look to the future. How else -- did any other parks in the city actually get set aside? And if you actually --

It showed the big stretch of the waterfront and they showed all these tiny little strips of green space. It's like we have been shell gamed out of any real opportunity to have a vision for the future of this city. We are building all this density and we are not really thinking about what these people need in terms of open space.

Now I have lived here 12 years in Dogpatch. There have not been a lot of people and there have not been a lot kids, they are more and more. But people have always been fighting over every inch of green space in this community. And it was a ghost town ten years ago. I now have a nine year old daughter and you can't even go to a street park because the street park has been completely taken over by dogs. And I am not an anti-dog person but there is just not a lot of room and there is not enough room now.

And even when you build this but then you add all this other density, which I abhor. If you don't plan for the open space we are all going to be at each other's throats. And this is the kind of park that is going to draw people from all over town because it is the sunniest part of the city and it is a beautiful place to be.

But you stick a development parcel in there and you're taking away an opportunity and it's gone for good. so if there is anything you can do on behalf of our community and the city of ours to say, enough is enough, don't trade our future for a short term advantage I beg you to do so. Thank you.

(Applause.)

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. Yes, please, go ahead.

(Several people speaking at once regarding who would comment next.)

MR. BARNES: My name is Bill Barnes, I was supervisor of the West Coast's largest outdoor program and it was at UCSF, it was called Outdoors Unlimited. I started it and ran it for 25 years and I retired in 2005.

Paul and I are both Bay Access board members. They got the San Francisco Bay Water Trail going. Got it signed by (indiscernible).

They got involved with Catellus, and that was the big enemy, Catellus. Catellus was the one that developed Mission Bay and they have buildings about 30 feet from the water and they're about five stories tall. If you ever want to go down there, they have a big, what do you call it, a ballpark, AT&T or whatever, right there on the water. You know, it happens.

But we could not let Mission Bay go without some kind of access for boats. They went beyond -- Catellus went beyond all of our dreams. If you ever look at that pier and that thing

down there you will go, my gosh. Well, Catellus gave it to us. I was, you know, at UCSF and I said we would be the stewards, that helped, but that's the way that (inaudible).

I then came to this thing here and I said, the last place in the whole West Coast practically for kayaking, for outriggers, all that stuff. It's got to happen there because there's no wind, there's no current and there's no winter feeding, it has to happen.

So I went -- I've been to every meeting, every meeting, and I've seen them move this thing that everybody is worried about from down low to up high to -- they were dealing with it the whole time. And I'm going, wow, this community stuff is just so good, it's so great, we don't have to answer to Catellus' board members or the stockholders, nothing. We can just -- wow, we can just go in here and develop what we want. And now, which is the fourth meeting, holy brrrr (phonetic).

(Laughter.)

MR. BARNES: Thank you. David, thank you. I forgot your name, thank you. Keep up the good work. And the guy that threw down the bone, I've seen him at many meetings before. He threw down the sail thing. He threw down the bone and left. Well, that can be dealt with. He can be dealt with, right? Absolutely. Easy, that's easy stuff. And this stuff that you guys are worried about, it can be done.

(Several people speaking at once.)

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you, thank you.

MR. BARNES: Negativity will get you nowhere.

SPEAKER: I am not being negative, Bill. I have been to these meetings as long as you have. You are happy, you are getting some access to --

SPEAKER: Can we get that discussion back up --

MR. BARNES: I'm done.

SPEAKER: Can we have the next speaker, please.

SPEAKER: Well, but he was actually talking to me so I am talking back to him.

(Several people speaking at once.)

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Does that conclude our --

(Nos.)

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I guess not. Please.

MR. VANDERSPEK: Again, I'm Hugh Vanderspek; I'm the General Manager for the shipyard. I apologize but the comment that there is no wind in the Central Basin is just not true. I'm here to tell you, we do -- relatively I'm sitting looking at 35 knots on an average afternoon these days. It depends on what time of the year but it's not --

And as far as the park, I commend everybody for all the work that's been done and I commend you all for being able to step up and say, I don't agree, I don't agree and I expect that when it's all done it's going to be something that's going to be talked about for decades.

The concern I have, however, is the concern with small craft. Last year we had somebody get killed over there in Islais Creek with a kayak. He got too close to a tugboat. He got pushed under, drowned and his body has never been found.

SPEAKER: I was there.

MR. VANDERSPEK: There you are.

SPEAKER: Did they find his body?

SPEAKER: No.

MR. VANDERSPEK: Right now Central Basin is incredibly shallow. And what's happened over the last 20 years is the size of the tugs that moves in and out of the Central Basin is much, much bigger. The ships are even quite a bit bigger, such that they are draft restricted. We have large tugs pushing these ships around. There is no maneuverability whatsoever and there is no room to move.

If we add small craft to this, and kayaks -- the plan to lay out half -- it says, here is the buoy line for kayaks, I can live with that, I really can, because I think I think that's tenable.

But I think if you put sailboats in there or dinghies or too many of the other things in there we're going to have huge problems here. We're setting ourselves up for a tragic it's not - it's not a maybe, it's going to happen.

When we have ships like the ships that come into the dry dock, of the amount of tugs and all the rest of the things that go on, they are very, very much restricted in their ability to maneuver.

We put children in kayaks or any other crafts, in the way of that somebody is going to get injured. That's my biggest concern with this entire plan. I think there's a lot of other areas as such on the San Francisco waterfront that are better suited for small craft, if there is small craft, human-powered craft or sailboats to put in there, I think it has to be very, very carefully.

The alternative is not good for the people in small crafts, it is certainly not good for those operating tugs, those operating ships in and out of the shipyard. That's all I have to say.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

One more? Two more.

SPEAKER: Yeah. I have to totally agree that I love small craft. I work -- I've worked with Nixon and Beau (phonetic) for years. But what comes first? The dry dock and its maritime use or recreational boating?

And I have a sailboat so I understand recreational sailboats and the chance to kayak all over the place.

This is an industrial spot. There are many, many more ships coming in and out. The large dry dock, which is (indiscernible) so it can lift larger ships, it's probably the only maritime use besides cruise ships, which will be picking up over the years, that the Port still has. And it is a port. And BCDC is in charge of the water and making sure that water-related things are encouraged and protected.

So while I think all of this planning is wonderful, if it hinges on the boat access -- we had boat access in the plan when I was working with AMB 10, 12 years ago. And it was quite a restricted type of thing that was planned for that. It included reuse of what is the shower/locker room as a headquarters for the kayakers.

I certainly supported the Water Trail with testimony and this that and the other thing. But I have to agree that you are jeopardizing what goes on at the BAE Systems, which is, like I say, probably the most important maritime use the Port still has in its books.

So be very cautious, in my mind, as to -- and everyone loves a park and everyone loves the access and everything else. I have to agree, why would you plant a tree where there was never a tree. But besides that, I know that you guys will figure it out. Thank you.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

MS. BECKMAN: Okay, last and hopefully very brief. Lori Beckman (phonetic). I have owned property on Illinois for close to 15 years so I lived here when no one knew what this neighborhood was like. It has always been texture and I think we need to keep that texture.

I completely, wholeheartedly agree with Topher and these ladies here that are saying that this building in front, this potential mystery building development in front of this urban beach is just absolutely crazy. That's a big mystery. This whole beautiful concept, I totally feel used by this. Like who wouldn't like the concept of the park, this beautiful park in this great neighborhood. The weather is terrific, everyone wants to be here.

But it's a huge section that is not well resolved and there's no answers. And it's not just my real estate that's affected, it's the -- it's a -- it's a sore in that whole scheme. So I completely disagree with that whole development. (Inaudible).

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. I thank all of you for your participation and ideas. It will help us come to some conclusions.

And thank, thank the presenters for their hard work.

At this time we are going to talk among ourselves. We may -- it's conceivable we might have a question for somebody in the audience but basically it's now kind of figuring out some strengths and weaknesses and so forth in what we have heard this afternoon and this evening.

I wonder if it would be inappropriate if I started with a

SPEAKER: You're the boss.

(Several people spoke at once.)

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Well I don't want to be pushy.

I think, you know, in hearing all these various ideas it seems to me that the very strongest opportunity for this neighborhood in this part of the city is to have a highly visible open space. And today I would say -- I mean, with what we have seen today there is two problems. One is --

We didn't talk about phasing, by the way, which I am looking at the old phasing plans. This area that we are talking about next to Illinois Street is the last phase. And there's probably nothing that would be more transformative for this neighborhood than to have a beautiful park sitting in this incredible location. And hopefully we'll never lose the industrial touch that the shipping provides.

And I should also say for the audience that for BCDC, our charge is maximum, feasible public access, literally physical access and visibility to the shoreline, and so that's kind of what I am talking about here. And that there would be, I think, from a BCDC point of view, a strong interest in being able to visualize the big ships, the history and some kind of a shoreline and park relief.

I do think the fact that it's the last phase and that and that there is this building that is being proposed, are inconsistent with the BCDC -- at least I'd like to put that forward and see what you all think.

SPEAKER: Here, here.

(Laughter.)

SPEAKER: Should we go down the line?

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Yeah, we could go down the line.

SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

SPEAKER: You want us to go next or?

SPEAKER: Do you normally speak to BCDC first and then hand it to us?

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: No, I think we mix it all up.

SPEAKER: Yes.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: We are one body here.

SPEAKER: We are one. We are one.

WDAC MEMBER KATHRIN MOORE: I wasn't quite prepared to be the second person but I will try.

I would agree with the notion that the most visible part is the Illinois Street open space and that the site should be brought forward without being encumbered by buildings. This is the one site which is more or less level, and would for that reason, is the easiest to become a usable site with not much ado.

I think if you don't have buildings on it you might not even have to raise it above sea level. The original idea, at least the way I learned it in school, is that open spaces are the easiest ones to accommodate sea level rise. It is buildings which require raising or plant and a significant investment in infrastructure.

Having said that, I would agree with two speakers who said that putting large scale development on the waterfront, a la Miami, or as you see it in New York more frequently lately, is not at all what San Francisco does or should do, particularly when we have sites in major downtown locations which sit close to the water and we haven't even provided sea level rise protection for those sites. So why would we use one residential building with a huge investment in raising the site by four feet and not having even resolved the transition to the ramp? I think that is a weaker point in the design approach and I think it speaks more for keeping the site without buildings and dealing with it in a complete, open space design.

And I am not commenting on any other parts yet or how would we treat the other parts that has the values well-described as presented but I think that's a separate discussion. I would like to talk about the feasibility of design-wise financially of Phase 1 and let the rest fall in place when it's time to do so.

WDAC MEMBER DAVID ALUMBAUGH: Okay. Yeah, I want to thank Alma in particular for the presentation today. I think that took the design further than it certainly was in June and I certainly understood it better than I did from the materials that I was reviewing.

I won't beat the potential development site on the head. I wish we had more information to sort of inform us about why it might be good there or why it might be not. But we don't have that in front of us.

I will say, though, on a large part I do think that the Illinois Street side of the park has not kind of developed the way I would have hoped that it had. I do think that the one way to connect the neighborhood and the city to the waterfront is to get that edge of Illinois Street and its relationship to the park, the open space and Crane Cove Park just perfect. I am not convinced that building a sidewalk along the fence and moving it 15 feet -- the fence 15 feet to the west and east -- is necessarily the best way to strengthen that edge.

I would like to see, in an ideal sense, having as much access between Illinois Street and the park, and particularly the open green, that you can have. Although I do understand the

comments from somebody, maybe Karen, who talked about being able to be up and looking down on the site and kind of understanding it from a bit above the site.

I do understand that but I do think the most important thing is to get the connection between the city and the neighborhood and the park as strong as possible. And I think once you've done that, to Kathrin's point, the rest, I think is -- or to John's point -- the rest is easier, in my opinion. That is, to me, the most critical issue that faces the design. And I think the other portions of the park are coming together nicely and I guess I'll leave my comments at that right now. Dan.

WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: I'm going to come back a little later but pass on this particular topic here, it's just getting worse.

WDAC MEMBER MARSHA MAYTUM: That means me. So I have five points. One, my big question is about phasing. You know, this is a tremendous gift to the city and we're investing millions of dollars, as was pointed out. And so understanding the phasing -- and I think as you mentioned -- is absolutely critical. And if there is one move that should be made I think it should be securing the view to the water and the beach and the view to the crane for the public.

And I completely agree with all the space about -- the comments about open space as this neighborhood densifies. So I think it's really important as your first move you start out with the most important move, which is being good stewards of the Bay and the views and the access to open space. So I think it's really critical to understand the phasing.

Secondly, the strength of the place. I think the comments were really great that the two cranes are the signatures points and that this is a most unusual outdoor space and it should really be celebrated and not masked. And I feel that a lot of the treatments -- and I also applaud the clarity of this presentation tonight, I do understand it a lot better now. But I still think there is a level of editing and simplification and a light touch, as was mentioned, that could really benefit the design. But again, the foremost mission is to be excellent stewards of this incredible industrial relic and not to mess it up.

So I think that one thing that really troubled me in understanding this is the covering up by four feet of dirt. So walking today there is that incredible base of the crane with its beautiful steel pieces and joinery and all that stuff and it was clear that that is all going to be covered up with dirt because somebody needs to build a 19th Street now. As I understand it, unless I'm missing something, 19th Street is driving all the grade change. So that seems to be a fundamental flaw in protecting what is most amazing about this resource because it would be a shame to have that beautiful base, sculptural terminus of the crane covered with dirt because somebody wants to have access down a street. So there has got to be another way to solve that.

And then finally just to really beat down that potential development site. I think it would really be beneficial in the stewardship role for the importance of open space and Bay access to look at densifying. Parcel 2, I think, was shown at the beginning of the -- of the presentation. But there has just got to be another way to think about gaining the revenue that is needed. There has to be, there has to be another site available rather than plugging forever this great view corridor to the Bay. That's it that was number five.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you.

DRB MEMBER GARY STRANG: I'd like to also just commend Alma and her team for, you know, a presentation that was really clear and made it really easy for us to, you know, see the issues, I think compared to last time. And I think that they also addressed, you know, a lot of the comments that we had in the previous meetings. Two of the main ones that come to mind are making the Slipway #4, you know, really central to the design of the park and also, I think, a much better water connection by, you know, extending, having these extensions out into the water, these overlook areas. So that seems very important.

I feel comfortable that the bones of this, the structure of this park and the historic preservation work that has been done is very solid. And I have a lot of questions about the details and how it's resolved but I don't know how we're ever going to get to those details if we don't move the project ahead.

You know, I think if we want densification, we want the environmental benefits of densification, that, you know, we need to have parks. And, you know, the open space allows the densification to happen. And as much as, you know, we want to preserve the historic character I think it's also important that we are constantly reinvigorating our cities and giving new life to this waterfront, not just preserving it and letting it crumble into the Bay.

That said, I do have a couple of comments. One is that there was -- in the previous scheme there was a mid-block connection to the park between 18th and 19th Street, which is no longer there. So I think I understand that that can be done different ways but I am kind of struggling with the idea that the park is raised to give it a better connection to the neighborhood but then there is a fence without a connection. So if there is going to be a fence and there is not going to be a connection then that seems like an opportunity to revisit the grading on Illinois and maybe I don't see why 19th Street couldn't be built, if that's the thing that needs to happen, with a different grading solution. I don't know what that would be, I don't have any ideas but it just seems like maybe there is something there that can be explored.

As far as the development parcel, I don't really want to talk about that but I think that there is a piece of landscape between the parcel and the beach and I don't think we really saw a concept for what that could possibly be. And maybe if we were to look at some ideas of what that could be that it might, in formal discussion (indiscernible).

And then finally, as far as trees go. I think it's appropriate to have some trees. An area this big I think can really benefit from shade, even if there is only, you know, 20 or 30 very hot days per year. You know, if you have been out on the waterfront on one of those fall or spring days I think it's really important to have, you know, some shade. So that's my comments.

DRB MEMBER CHERYL BARTON: The advantage of being the seventh person to speak is that it is an opportunity to second good ideas. I also want to commend Alma and company for the presentation. Much, much clearer, many more questions answered this time so nice work.

The parcel is not in the park/is in the park. As everyone has said it's in the park. That has to do with the Illinois Street edge and I agree that the Illinois Street edge is very unresolved because there are sheer forces that are outside the park that require the ambiguity.

But I think we would be really neglecting our mandate for public access to not question - more than question. Get rid of the development parcel and certainly consider the density

transfer. It really rebounds whatever equation it was that ended up with development being required there. I think it has to be open, it is a park.

Those are the big ideas. The small ones are -- or the smaller ones are: I still also have concern about the topographic change and how that works with the structural qualities of the cranes and the crane rails. Again, it's in the details but I am concerned about that topographic change.

And then I do feel that there is a loss of the character-defining grit, if you will, still a bit. I appreciate the simplification of the landscape elements but I still think there's still too much grass and still too many trees so that needs to be toned down.

DRB MEMBER EPHRAIM HIRSCH: I can't disagree with a landscape architect who says there is too much grass and too much trees. You want shade, I think you can introduce some industrial elements that would shade the property.

MS. BARTON: Immediately, as opposed to --

MR. HIRSCH: It's immediate instead of waiting --

MS. BARTON: Fifteen, 20 years.

MR. HIRSCH: -- for whatever kind of tree that will thrive and grow and provide proper shade.

I think you need to as -- I'll back Marsha in the statement about expose those rails, expose as much as possible of the industrial character of the park. It can work with -- it can be people friendly, it just requires thought and design.

The issue of this developed parcel here that Topher so eloquently addressed. I've got a little bit of a -- this may be not farcical, I don't think, but it's a technical hook here. That actually if you look at the blue BCDC line, we can poke into that because the water line actually pokes in at that point. So our BCDC jurisdiction goes right -- cuts that property in half.

(Laughter.)

MR. HIRSCH: So I think we have a little more clout there than we perhaps thought.

And then from the macro to the micro, I will reiterate my concern about that fence all along the edge of the water. I mean, you know, there are lots of borders that maintain this bullhead and we certainly could use these keel blocks to provide a barrier so people don't fall in the water but still allow a visual access to the Bay.

My other points are kind of minor ones. I'm just still curious about the orientation of that crane down the line, how it changes from one way to the other. I don't know if it makes any difference. And maybe it's moveable, maybe we can rotate it from time to time, that would be exiting.

I think everyone has said everything that -- yeah, you can't develop this property piecemeal. This COMING SOON can't be soon enough.

WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: John, now that we've gotten through this and the development site parcel I can go through a couple of points that I'm hearing in the group here about what's been accomplished.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Could I add one more point to your list?

WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Sure.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Another element of this visibility to the park along Illinois Street as a new and powerful amenity to the community but also to the city as a whole. I want to add

that the visibility also creates a greater sense of public safety. When you have public spaces walled off from public observance it can get very scary when it's very hard to manage. And for that reason maybe, as much as the beautiful views, it's worth considering.

WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: I also just wanted to thank the team for a really incredible presentation and the walk. Everything, that was very fun, but it also provided a lot of clarity as to some of the very simple diagrams going back all the way to explaining traces and patches and how it went. I think -- although I think there are some changes coming out of the group from what's there I think that helped with the understanding of it, so I think it was very strong and I really want to express my thanks for that.

There's a number of parts of the project that aren't raising any concern. We are not hearing about it in our discussion, we didn't hear about it from the public. And I think that's because people are very comfortable with it and I just wanted us to be able to mention a couple of those.

One is, there is a significant open green being added to the neighborhood at not a huge expense. It is not resolved how that meets Illinois Street or how that meets 19th but I think there is a lot of support for going ahead with that concept.

There is also the area on the east side of the slipway where the trees do come into, and Building 110 is over there, as having a plaza space that is a -- it has a flexible use, it has trees in it and it traces the historic rail lines. I think there was a lot of -- there's a lot of acceptance for that.

Also what was mentioned somewhat in our conversation was the way the project reaches out to the water. It has fingers that go out there; the access ways adjacent to Slipway 3, as an example. And also how the -- on either side of Slipway 4 and the expressions of how Slipways 1 and 2 used to reach out there. I think those are strong things we haven't heard objections to. I think people are comfortable with that, correct me if I'm wrong.

And there is an expression also of the Bay coming into the park. I don't necessarily feel the details of how that planting works or resolves or how even you access it is, but the concept is very strong and it looks great on the drawing. I just want to note that as something we provide this team to go ahead with.

Also, of course, human-powered craft. We heard from the crowd here, we heard it up here, great interest in doing that.

I don't need to go into detail on Parcel 1. The development potential, I think this committee has spoken. The concerns, everything from public safety to visual access to long-term potential so I'll be quiet on that.

The areas that I see needing more work are how 19th Street meets that south end of the slipway. Concerns about burying part of the utility rack and some of the interesting equipment. Also some desire to have the lawn actually be below Illinois Street to differentiate it as a space, although that wasn't -- I don't think there was a consensus for that. But I encourage the team to go back and look at -- look at alternatives for a grading solution as you get to that south end there. I definitely heard that coming from the Committee.

And I think also we would be looking for -- the disability concern was very real. It went on for a while but it was very real. In looking at the pavement types and as we see it presented in the future to make sure it meets those needs. Of course, that's required but we will

need to see those. And that also could help resolve how Slipway 4 sits quietly over the park, as to what type of pavement surfaces are put adjacent to that and comes into and doesn't end up with quite such a graphic as we see on there now. But how the park really marries with the slipway. I hope that's clear.

Have I gotten the main points as I summarized there?

(Several people speaking at once.)

WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: I recognized all the comments that were coming on the development site.

MS. BARTON: Phasing. What about phasing? Or is that --

WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Phasing, yes. There was a strong preference for the project along Illinois Street to be built first and that, I think, extends the entire length from 19th Street up to the Ramp Restaurant.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Good.

WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: Am I correct on that?

MS. MOORE: I think is fair to restate that the majority of concerns come from the majority of people here. And while the elements we could discuss and positively shed light on particular design choices et cetera, I think the overriding concern I hear are about the conceptual setup of phasing to the site adjoining Illinois Street and not being the development site and how that, in a way, sets a different theme for a park. It would eliminate grading, it would resolve issues of visibility, it would resolve issues of themes, the crane and its structural elements which are as important as eloquently described by Marsha.

And so I think by you summarizing all the other positive things, I think you in a way are not fully acknowledging that the majority of comments really deal with questions and concerns rather than acknowledging the details which we can appreciate later once the plan is more properly aligned around those objectives which we are expressing. And I think it is very important to keep that in mind.

I am not trying to diminish the work that has been done, the detail to which particular things are addressed. But the bigger idea, which we are here to support and move forward, is really not there. I just have to really say that so that we are not missing of what I heard 10 or 12 people say.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

MS. MIRAMONTES: I mean, I can attempt to do a --

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Would you try to summarize, please.

MS. MIRAMONTES: I can attempt to do a summary too and see if you can all fill in the blanks here.

You say that phasing is a very big concern and what happens when. What comes first, whether it's the --

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: We'd prefer --

(Several people speaking at once.)

MS. MIRAMONTES: There was a lot of concern with the development site. Impacts on views and public safety.

Some more minor points: Trees, various opinions on ways to provide shade.

There was concern -- actually I am not sure that I got the point about the grade changes so if somebody could clarify those concerns about grade changes. What are the specific concerns?

MS. MOORE: People spoke about raising the Illinois Street side, raising the site by four feet without having a solution of how you transition towards The Ramp. So you're basically creating a vertical separation from anything going north on the waterfront.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Okay.

MS. MOORE: In addition to that I think it creates additional problems as you move south and come to the extension of 19th Street, further accentuating the rather extensive movement between those two portions of the site.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Okay. And also --

MS. MAYTUM: And it would necessitate covering part of the crane.

SPEAKER: And covering the crane.

MS. MOORE: Right.

MS. MAYTUM: So another grading solution should be reviewed.

MS. MIRAMONTES: I am not sure if the Port may be able to clarify some of those questions because I don't think --

WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: I think we're looking for another alternative for how the plaza at the south end of Slipway 4 is graded. The elements -- all the way up to the intersection of Illinois and 19th.

MS. MIRAMONTES: Okay. And expose the industrial character as much as possible.

Reconsider the Illinois Street edge, along its length.

And disability concerns should be given attention and resolved.

Anything other major missing?

MS. MOORE: There is one element missing and I have not been able to speak to it. Should we have a development site? Let's assume for the moment that that does not go away. Should we assume that the land is raised by four feet? I would like to know how the beach works. Normally a beach gradually transitions towards the water. However, we were told that the site is really affected by rising sea level and tides only in the winter months. Does that mean that in the best times of the year you are sitting four feet above the water's edge and you are not able to go down there, or are you creating a slope which starts at the building site and slopes gradually down to the side of the beach?

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay, the beach idea, we need more information on that.

And if that is a good first round then I would like to ask the applicant if they have any -- David, if you have any -- if you would like to comment on our deliberations.

MR. BEAUPRÉ: Yes I would. First of all, thank you for your comments.

We do have some slides on phasing so I would like to show those to you. They're pretty similar to what you have seen in the past. But we did look at phasing and I think it's worth touching on quickly.

The other thing that I'd like to address is the comment of how the proposed grading works. I think, Marsha, you made mention that you thought we were burying part of the utility racks and the base of the crane structure and that's not the case. And I think that's really an important and critical comment that you made.

(Off the record discussion locating slide.)

MR. BEAUPRÉ: So right now, again, our total estimated budget is about \$45 million and we have about 21.3.

Just to give the context of where a lot of the costs are for the project. We are at about \$19 million for the preservation of the cranes, the slipway, Building 109, moving the fence, Building 110 and improvements to some of the shoreline around the slipway. So that's about \$19 million. Shoreline cleanup and restoration, this work in here, and the beach is at about \$4.5 million. The new infrastructure, the sidewalk along Illinois Street, 19th Street, utilities, stormwater, \$4.5 million. Hardscape, \$9 million. And then the softscape is at \$5 million, the site furnishing at 2.9. About \$5 million an acre, roughly.

If you pull out the historic preservation element that's down to about \$3 million.

Dolores Park, the City is spending \$7 million an acre on, Mission Bay parks are going about \$3 million an acre, we just spent about \$3 million an acre on Heron's Head park. So for a site that has shoreline conditions that need cleanup, that need site remediation, that have historic resources, \$5 million an acre is not out of the realm of prices that are occurring today.

And with that \$21.3 million we had we felt that the appropriate first phase was a park along Illinois Street where we had a lot of consensus about the multi-purpose green; Slipway 4, that I think everybody realizes is the central core and important feature including the two cranes; shoreline clean-up, although not the full extent of the improvements although we'd like to leverage the resources we have to clean up the debris that's out there today; 19th Street, which provides benefit not only to the park but other aspects of Pier 70 as well. It takes the truck traffic off of 20th Street, it's a connection and closing a gap on the Bay Trail, it connects you over to 20th Street. And then Building 109 as well. So we thought that was an appropriate first phase.

We think that this ideally, this triangle would help kind of balance off the part of the site, what we call the 109/110 Forecourt area. Maybe we can do a minimum level of improvements out there to open it up to the public but this is what we think we can deliver for certain.

And now what I'd like to do is just -- if we can go to that grading slide that shows how we address meeting 19th Street and the plaza at Slipway (indiscernible).

(Discussion to determine slide.)

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Could we ask a question while you're searching?

MR. BEAUPRÉ: Sure. There we go.

MS. MOORE: The question I'm asking is, if you would reverse the phasing sequence and, for example, the Illinois Street site would become Phase 1, wouldn't that leave the Pier 70 and Forest City with the responsibility to pay for the road themselves?

MR. BEAUPRÉ: The roadway is not -- does not really support Forest City, it actually -- it benefits -- 19th Street benefits 20th Street and the historic core and the connection over to 20th Street. The Forest City site is the southeastern portion of the site.

It also -- 19th Street does provide as a primary access point into this part of the park.

WDAC CHAIR HODAPP: John, we have to be a little careful here about how we conduct the meeting. If we start giving new information and we want to provide direction we have to open up public comment again. So we need to get a response from the presenter but we

need to follow better meeting rules here as to how we operate and provide advice. And I think we have provided some direction here so I just want to caution you.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Okay, continue.

MR. BEAUPRÉ: So if I may. The other thing that we heard pretty loud and clear through the community planning process up to this point was the desire to connect this open space with the community and to address the grade issue.

We did look at, actually in the early concept, that bridge where it was a pile-supported roadway that came in and allowed access underneath here. There was a lot of opposition from the public about that pile-supported access so what we looked at is using fill to bring the street in, to bring the grade up. It helps to address the environmental conditions of needing to cap the site.

And then you may recall that we are moving Crane 14 out to align with 18th Street, so this slipway here, while it gets buried for a little portion over in here, and we actually illustrate that it's buried by showing the utility rack as being slightly filled in as well, as well as keeping Building 30's grade at its existing site so that you can recognize that this is the new heart of the park. But none of the crane foundations, none of the crane wheels are being covered up or buried as a part of it. And then it allows this amphitheater-type of use where you might be able to do outdoor theater within the park by having the terraces down.

And if we can just go back to the phasing again.

MS. MAYTUM: Excuse me, just one second, I just want to make sure I'm understanding this. My question was on the crane to the left of the screen that is not shown.

MS. DUSOLIER: The crane remains in its current location. Both cranes need to be moved and a new foundation needs to be built because that is one way to stabilize them. But they will -- basically this yellow surface will fill up into that, so the runway is actually left open and the cranes in their current location.

MS. MAYTUM: So there is a two foot well around the bottom of the cranes?

MS. DUSOLIER: No, the whole runway continues.

MS. MAYTUM: I'm not talking about the runway, I'm talking about --

MR. BEAUPRÉ: No, it stays at the existing grade.

MS. DUSOLIER: It basically is an edge. I'm sorry, this generally focuses on the corner. But basically there will forms. It's an edge on this side and then the grade comes down to meet the --

MS. MAYTUM: So it's in a pit.

MS. DUSOLIER: It's not in a pit, it's being framed on two sides. And the main point being again, as David was describing, part of the discussions that we have with our preservation is that basically you leave it in place, you create these two steps that actually frame it. So you basically can sit -- if you remember the size of those cranes.

SPEAKER: Mm-hmm.

MS. DUSOLIER: The crane will be here. There will be two steps on two sides only, that is where we're filling. So those new steps, you will sit basically at the edge of this crane. The idea being, again, that then you are very much aware that this is a new element added on top of the slipway and the runway itself is perfectly as existing and preserved.

MS. MAYTUM: Okay. It would be great to have a section.

MS. DUSOLIER: We do have a lot more information I can just pull out here. We have a specific grading plan that I can make available to all of you if that is really what matters at this stage.

MR. BEAUPRÉ: The other thing that I would just like to go back to is that on the phasing plan what we have said as a part of the project is we know that we don't have the funds to do this portion right now. We're hoping that we can do a little bit more here. We have always thought that for this development we would need to come back to this design review body. We do have the opportunity to maybe eliminate this whole portion of the park now because we don't have funding for it anyway. Pull it out of the project, and when we have funding come back to the group and figure out if this is how the program works.

(Nos.)

SPEAKER: That part is only \$5 million.

(Several people speaking at once.)

MS. MAYTUM: I have a question about -- and tell me if I'm going beyond. Building 109. That was included in Phase 1 because? Is car parking that important or is the resource so fragile?

MR. BEAUPRÉ: The resource is incredibly fragile. It also served as -- if you're coming from 20th Street where the most significant historic resources are and where we have a development partner that is moving forward quickly and hoping to have occupancy in 2015 for the historic core, this becomes the main entry into the park. And it also -- there is the opportunity for off-street parking and interpretation of artifacts. We are not proposing any parking along 19th Street. There is a limited amount of parking between 18th and 19th Street on the street. And we felt to provide full accessibility to all, that providing some off-street parking was important.

MS. MAYTUM: Thank you.

MR. BEAUPRÉ: I don't know if there were any other significant issues that we need to spend the time on this evening unless?

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: I guess I would like to understand something a little more clearly. Phase 2 is \$19 million, that's the maritime fields. Phase 3 is \$5 million and, you know, it might even be expanded somewhat in it's area. Can't Phase 2 be reduced in its ambition and put to Phase 3? And actually Phase 3 could be Phase 2 or Phase 1.

SPEAKER: Phase 1.

(Several people speaking at once.)

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: No, I mean, Phase 1, but what about Phase 2?

MR. BEAUPRÉ: It's really, quite frankly, it's -- the cost for Phase 2 is some of the shoreline clean-up and disposal. What we were hopeful that we might be able to do is not even -- if we can't open up Building 110 right off the bat at least open up the park around it. So there's remediation, there's material disposal, there's the paving around the slipways. There may be a way that we can look at bringing the cost down here. We said phase -- either one of these phases could go beforehand.

When we had the development parcel we thought, because this part of the site does need to be elevated. If we left it alone today and opened it, the park would be closed most of the time and it would be an unsafe condition a lot of the other time. So we felt with this --

SPEAKER: What does that mean "most of the time?"

(Several people speaking at once.)

PORT STAFF MEMBER BYRON RHETT: I think it's something that we can look at. I think your point is -- I think we feel very strongly that the Phase 1 phasing is really the most important. Those historic resources -- we feel pretty strongly about Building 109, the combination of its condition, the access, all the things that David explained. But we're hearing your concern about what's shown as the Phase 3 area.

We, as it relates to Phase 2, have the most concern about, what I'll say is the phase closest to -- to the -- to the ship ways. But I think we can look at what are the opportunities to address that, which we think would be important in trying to complete that area. But also looking at if there is any way to accelerate the elements of what's shown here as Phase 3, based on both the cost and the other issues that you raised about the significance of that edge o the water.

MS. MAYTUM: I have one other question. I'm sorry to do this but I think this is super important about the phasing. And I'm coming at it from a historic architectural point of view and understanding the resources. Oh, you just took the picture down.

MR. BEAUPRÉ: Oh, sorry. Probably I did that.

MS. MAYTUM: You're editing me.

MR. BEAUPRÉ: Not intentionally.

MS. MAYTUM: So I think it's -- I appreciate the comments about 109. And I think as part of the editing process in making allocations of funds to achieve the greatest good it might be interesting to look at the costing of say the removing and rehabilitation of Building 30. And I wanted to ask Mark what -- you know, what the level of high importance is of that. Is that something that might be moved? I know it's moved as a part of Phase 1. But is that something that could be re-moved and redeveloped later and take those funds and put it towards securing the views on the beach. I mean, there may be an allocation emerging so that you can achieve what you want to do in Phase 1.

MR. DAVIS: Architectural Resources Group looked at that and said that in order for the park project overall to meet the Secretary of the Interior's standards that you either have to rehab the building or relocate it elsewhere but not to demolish it.

MS. MAYTUM: No, I'm suggesting that you put the rehabilitation of that into a later phase. You don't destroy the resource but you're already moving it. So if you could move it and then just, you know, wait to do that work later you could then -- stabilize it but take those resources towards securing the Illinois Street and the views and the beach. Just thinking in the editing process it sounds like you're open to looking at how you might massage those allocations of funds and resources.

MR. DAVIS: I don't know how significant that is to the overall price but I think that there is probably a way to do that.

MS. MAYTUM: I just point that out as an example, I'm sure there are other things about the treatment of the rails -- You know, there's a whole host of decisions that's made when you're doing a historic renovation and all of those decisions have a price tag.

MR. BEAUPRÉ: That's a great point. And the one that we looked at before, even on the idea of taking one of the cranes and parking it offsite and doing that too. Because those cranes

are not inexpensive. So we have been looking at those tradeoffs and trying to figure out how we can maximize what Phase 1 is.

And then, you know, part of that too is, for instance on the cranes, as Alma mentioned, we need to move them once anyway to make them seismically safe. So if you're in the process of moving it once you probably want to move it back at the same time. But we will continue to look at those trade-offs to see how we can deliver, you know, an appropriate Phase 1 that makes sense.

MS. MAYTUM: Thank you.

DRB CHAIR KRIKEN: Thank you. So I will adjourn this meeting. Thank you all.

Thank you all in the audience for coming.

(Thereupon, the joint meeting of the BCDC Design Review Board and Port of San Francisco's Waterfront Design Advisory Committee was adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.)

--oOo--

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I, RAMONA COTA, a Certified Electronic Reporter and Transcriber, certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording provided to me.

/s/ Ramona Cota

RAMONA COTA, CERT**478

September 25, 2013